

PERIODICAL ROOM  
RECEIVED  
Volume XXXI  
JAN 31 1916

FEBRUARY, 1916

Number 2

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH

WILLIAM KURRELMMEYER

JAMES EUSTACE SHAW

## CONTENTS

SHEARER, AUGUSTUS HUNT.—'Theophania,'	65
COLLITZ, HERMANN.—Goethe's Use of 'vergakelt,'	75
LONG, PERCY W.—Spenseriana: 'The Lay of Clorinda,'	79
BRIGHT, JAMES W.—Anglo-Saxon 'umbor' and 'seld-guma,'	82
STURTEVANT, ALBERT MOREY.—Zur Syntax des Verbums 'meinen' im Althochdeutschen,	85
JENNEY, ADELINE M.—A Note on Cynewulf's 'Christ,'	91
KURRELMMEYER, W.—Doppeldrucke von Goethe's 'Tasso,' 1816,	94

### Reviews:—

CAROLINE BOURLAND, <i>Las Paredes Oyen</i> , por Juan Ruiz de Alarcón. [F. O. Reed.]	95
GUSTAVE LANSON, <i>Les Méditations poétiques</i> , par Alphonse de Lamartine. [E. Carcassone.]	104
THORNTON SHIRLEY GRAVES, <i>The Court and the London Theatres during the Reign of Elizabeth</i> . [Dudley H. Miles.]	107
JOHN LEES, <i>The German Lyric</i> . [J. T. Hatfield.]	109

### Correspondence:—

REED, EDWARD BLISS.—Herrick and <i>Naps upon Parnassus</i> ,	111
CURRY, WALTER CLYDE.—The Judgment of Paris,	114
PEEBLES, ROSE JEFFRIES.—A Note on <i>Hamlet</i> ,	117
BAIRSTOW, MARJORIE.—Milton's Use of the Forms of Epic Address,	120
HAMMOND, ELEANOR PRESCOTT.—Chaucer and Dante and Their Scribes,	121
CRAWFORD, J. P. WICKERSHAM.—Two Spanish Imitations of an Italian Sonnet,	122
COAD, ORAL S.—A Note on <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> ,	123

### Brief Mention:—

GILBERT CHINARD, "Notes sur le prologue d' <i>Atala</i> ," and "Notes sur le voyage de Chateaubriand en Amérique";—The Letters of Edward Dowden and his Correspondents;—H. H. WILLIAMS, <i>Jacke Jugeler</i> ;—I. GOLLANCZ, <i>The Parlement of the Three Ages</i> : an alliterative poem on the Nine Worthies and the Heroes of Romance;—F. M. SNELL, Jonson's <i>Tale of a Tub</i> ,	125
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Thirty-Five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

---

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION (with inter-  
mission from July to October inclusive)

---

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

---

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume  
is \$2.00 for the United States and Mexico; \$2.25  
for other countries included in the Postal Union.

---

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to Murray P. Brush; and for the Italian and Spanish Departments to J. E. Shaw. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

---

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays, and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

---

## An Unmistakable Gallican Atmosphere

Pervades

### LONGMANS' MODERN FRENCH COURSE

This is of vast assistance to the teacher in establishing a sympathetic and appreciative attitude on the part of the student toward the French Language. The course aims at teaching speaking as well as reading and writing French. It does not rely merely on imitation, but insists on a systematic study of grammar, because no thorough knowledge of a language can be obtained otherwise. Noteworthy features are its simplicity, its freshness of material, its careful gradation and its unusual pictures, which serve as a basis for lessons in conversation. Part I, 50 cents; Part II, 50 cents. Teacher's Edition—price on application.

### LONGMANS' FRENCH TEXTS

A new series of readers having large, clear and well-spaced type, the simple and novel arrangement of which serves as a guide to correct pronunciation. Teacher's editions.

*Write for full information.*

---

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

449 Fourth Ave., New York

2457 Prairie Ave., Chicago, Ill.

120 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.







# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXI

FEBRUARY, 1916

NUMBER 2

## *THEOPHANIA:*

### AN ENGLISH POLITICAL ROMANCE OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Many tales and romances were published in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of which we have an inclusive knowledge since the publication of the very complete bibliography of Arundell Esdaile.<sup>1</sup> Some of these tales were translations from other languages, especially the French; others were purely imaginative, altho the product of imagination appears very dry; and others had some connection with history. It would be saying too much to declare that the historical tales had a plot, yet there appear occasionally climaxes or crises or *dénoûements* which are different from the usual form of a slender narrative interspersed with long stories recited by different persons of the drama. In a few cases, the history is used for a setting while the tale may run wild between occasional facts; in others, ancient kingdoms are mentioned without much regard for accurate statements. In still others, however, the form of a tale is used as a medium for satire, or for comment upon contemporary conditions. There are not many of the latter; the earliest is the translation of John Barclay's *Argenis*, 1625, and there are a few which follow, interesting from both the historical and the literary side.

One of these historical romances is *Theophania*, published in 1655, and covering about fifty years of English history in its supposed account of the Kingdom of Sicily. Very little seems to be known of this book, for none of the general accounts of English literature of the period mention it, nor do any of the historians

<sup>1</sup> *A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed before 1740.* By Arundell Esdaile. London, 1912. See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxix, 45 f.

who cover the period refer to it. There are at present in existence, according to my investigations, at least five copies,—in the British Museum; Chetham's Library, Manchester; City Library, Manchester; Library of Congress; and The Newberry Library, Chicago. Henry Kersley owned a copy in 1851, for he wrote to *Notes and Queries* to inquire further about the book; James Crossley owned a copy at the time, for he replied in 1852 concerning it. Kersley's copy may be one of those already mentioned (except the British Museum copy); Crossley's, which had certain manuscript notes, cannot be traced in any library, or in the sales catalogs of Crossley's books. Doubtless there are other copies extant, and it is to be hoped that Crossley's copy will be found.

The author of *Theophania* is anonymous,—“An English Person of Quality,”—but Crossley's copy had a manuscript note, “Sir William Sales.” According to this, the Library of Congress attributes the book to him, but no biographical list so far examined makes reference to such a man.

In the Newberry Library copy, a few manuscript notes appear in the margin. One of these identifies Theodora, Queen of Sicily, with Elizabeth of England. With this as a clue, and with two other slight intimations, I have come to conclude that the whole book as it stood was but a mask for a mildly partizan account of the early years of the Civil War in England; and that every name both of person and of place conceals a real character or a locality in the English history of the time. With this revelation of historical opinions and of literary problems, the deadly dull romance assumes a new character, and its deciphering becomes a real pleasure.

The story, in brief, is of several noble gentlemen who by chance find refuge from shipwreck, or from their enemies in civil war, at the house of Synesius, a courtly gentleman who lives on the coast of Sicily. These include, first, Demetrius, a comely prince of Achaia, who is doubtless William II of Orange. A marginal note on page 5 calls him “King ———,” while on page 41 it calls him “Prince of Ora——”; unfortunately the margins have been cut, so that in neither case is the annotation complete. The purpose of Demetrius is the pursuit of Mariana, daughter of Antiochus (Charles I) and sister of Alexandro (Prince Charles), altho historically the Prince of Orange and Mary were married in

1641, and Demetrius's sighs served only to heighten the story anachronously.

The second recipient of the hospitality of Synesius is Alexandro, who is no other than Prince Charles, in love with Theophania, for whom he also sighs frequently. His heartfelt affection for her, shown in the early pages and in one or two references later, offers the only occasions for mentioning the character that gives the title to the book. Probably she was the French princess with whom negotiations for marriage with Charles were carried on for a while. Charles himself is represented as a god-like being, whom everyone recognizes immediately by his superb form and divine grace.

Cenodoxius is the third chief guest, and he is recognized as the Earl of Essex, not only from his story but also from the marginal note of "Erl of Es——."

These three men have to pass the time away somehow at the house of Synesius, especially while Demetrius is recovering from sickness brought on by exposure; the object is accomplished by having the stories of the chief characters told. Prince Charles is too unfortunate and too sacred to have a story; so the first tale is that of Demetrius and Mariana, told by Lysander, the companion of Demetrius, with the latter's permission while he is still in bed under a physician's care. The story is rather simple. Demetrius being a remarkable youth who has won fame as a young soldier for the Peloponnesians (Dutch) is sent on an expedition against the Emperor of Greece (Greece is probably Spain, altho sometimes the description seems to fit the German Empire as well or better). On this expedition Demetrius penetrates with ease to Constantinople, the capital, but spares it because of the noble demeanor of the Empress, and because of the love at sight he conceives for the princess Mariana (the English Mary), who has been betrothed to a Grecian prince and is still in Greece mourning the death of Leonidas, her betrothed. Demetrius returns home with great plaudits, but when his parents suggest a marriage with the Queen of Armenia(?) to support the position of the Orange family, he leaves home; he falls into a misunderstanding with Mariana with whom he has never spoken; but he manages to impress his devotion upon her, and it is upon his way to England in pursuit of her that he is shipwrecked, as told at the opening of the romance.

Fortunately for the book, about the time that Lysander finishes Cenodoxius appears, and altho he is looked on with suspicion because he led the Parliamentary forces against the king, he has a chance to tell his story and that of his father Heraclius, as justification for his actions. This story of the Earls of Essex starts with the reign of Elizabeth and deals rather harshly with her, attributing the main reasons for England's present unfortunate condition to her. The unhappy fate of the older Essex is described in detail, and the equally unhappy circumstances of the early life of the younger Essex are used to show why he was willing to be a leader in the war against Charles I, altho not in entire sympathy with the cause he was leading. In the course of his story he gives an account of several battles of the Civil War. His story ends with his leaving the army and escaping by chance to the house of Synesius, where he recognizes Prince Charles; without being at all humble, he seeks accommodation with Charles and the royalists.

This latter proposition forms the wedge to admit a discourse by Synesius on the English Constitution, which is directed to the end of urging Charles to a reconciliation with Essex. This is about to be accomplished when a captive is brought in from the Royal army, a leader of ability and prowess. He too recognizes Prince Charles and tells the story of Clorimantes (himself) and Perrotus, two noble soldiers, both of whom had fallen in love with another paragon of womanliness, Monelia. Perrotus is killed, Monelia therefore kills herself, and Clorimantes was on the way to find those responsible for the death of Perrotus, when he was brought in a captive. The story of Monelia ends thus; but as there was in it some reference to Philocles (Prince Rupert), Cenodoxius (Essex) upon request gave Prince Charles a full account of the passage concerning Philocles, which Clorimantes had touched on in his discourse; then, "it being already far advanced in the night, left him to his privacy. Finis."

Certainly an unsatisfactory ending from the point of view of romance, for Demetrius has not as yet any hope of Mariana, altho Alexandro (Charles) has promised a good word for him; Cenodoxius is a leader fled from his own party and not received by the others; Clorimantes seeks vengeance, which he seems unlikely to accomplish. As to the historical features, also, there is

no conclusion,—Prince Charles is trying to make up his mind what to do, and Cromwell is hovering in the background. Such are the separate stories that are woven into the tale, and such is the complete tale of *Theophania*.

Altogether no less than one hundred and eight names of persons appear, some mentioned only once or twice, and some having very insignificant parts, yet most of them introduced with a certain degree of carefulness, suggesting that they are counterparts of real persons. Only occasionally does it seem that the character is fictitious, in order to fill out the story. In many cases the array of names of minor characters serves to deaden what interest there is in the tale, unless one is reading with a detective sense for identification. In a very few cases there is some similarity, or a reason, in the choice of names,—as, Mariana for Mary, or Evaldus, a transposition for Laud; but for the most part the names are without significance, except that the author tries to make them in keeping with the country they come from.

Similarly, there are twenty-seven places named, and there is an attempt to keep them in some sort of geographical relation. Sicily is England; Palermo, the capital, is London. The Grecian Empire is Spain; the Peloponnesus, which revolts, is the United Provinces; Sparta is the capital. Cyprus is Scotland; and Sardinia, Ireland, with its capital, Oristagnum (= Dublin, 'dark pool?'). Thessaly seems to be the Palatinate of the Rhine. In the account of the Civil War, the ingenuity of the author wanes somewhat,—Essex marches against Cornavii (Cornwall?); the King's standard is unfurled at Mottingham (Nottingham); the King marches into Coritani(?); Tropanio was Edgehill. Nicosia stands for Oxford, and Coves (Coves?) is where Essex tried to intercept the king. Galia is France.

While there is an attempt to keep these names in their proper places, there are some confusions or complete fictions. Philocles, for instance, combines characteristics of both Frederick V, the Winter King of Bohemia, and his son, Prince Rupert, who fought with Charles I. Demetrius, also, combines the persons of Maurice of Nassau, the wonder in fighting, and William II, who marries Mary; or else Polidor, his father, combines the characters of William I, and of Maurice. Also at times there seems to be confusion between Spain and the Holy Roman Empire as to which is meant by "Greece"; and between the German Emperor and

the Pope, as to the counterpart of "Roman Emperor." Elizabeth is recorded as doing some of the acts of Henry VIII, and the chronology of the older Essex is false; but for the most part the historical and geographical relations are kept clear.

The political opinions of the "English Person of Quality," who wrote the book, center about four topics. First is the person of Charles, already referred to. He is spoken of (p. 23) as a "knight that seemed to perform more than humane actions," of "admirable valour," of "majestick beauty," the "perfection of all his sex," of "such a royal meine that both knees and hearts were ready to bow at his devotion." As the person of the prince indicated divinity, Demetrius calls him "Divine creature," and Synesius says "my Genius gives me an assurance that you have divinity about your person," and again (page 196), "a Prince who is deputed by Heaven, to exercise a Kingly power upon earth, ought in this to imitate the Supreme Deity." From these extracts, it is easy to understand the attitude of the "English Person of Quality" towards the monarchy and the person of the royal heir.

As to Elizabeth, the main source for opinions is the story of Cenodoxius, which not only relates facts, but attributes motives, altho it occasionally gives Elizabeth credit or discredit for more than she did. It tells how she secured the crown, and "thro a seeming popularity brought the people into a slavish obedience." Her character was "cruel and ambitious," but "nevertheless surpassing even all her sex in the art of dissembling, she so veiled it with a mark of affability" that even her violent proceedings, her frequent oppressions, her violation of the laws, and her profound dissimulations, were so cloaked that she won the hearts of the people and of the nobles. Her marriage schemes were political until England's position was established, then she admitted "divers Favourites to more than ordinary familiarity, as often as her fancie pleased, [and] disgraced some and advanced others, to the same hopes." This brings us to the beginning of the regard she showed Essex; also to the relations with Rome, which supported "Aurelia, Queen of Cyprus" (Mary, Queen of Scots) in her claim to the throne; and the attempt of Castorex (Ridolfi) to kill Elizabeth, from which he was prevented by Essex (error). This event is given as the cause of the hostility to Rome, and all the arguments and acts against Rome follow immediately. The priests were driven out, and the temples destroyed, while the people



approved. Elizabeth said (page 115), "We must no longer suffer these idle superstitions to reign among us," and "she assumed to herself and her successors the sacred office of the High Priesthood." "I have not altered," she said, "anything of the ancient forms"; but she declared she was forced to oppose Rome because it would not give up its support of "Aurelia."

The third topic of political interest discussed is what Synesius calls the "English Constitution,"—really a discussion of English policy, both domestic and foreign, compared with the policies of other nations. Synesius rather idealizes other countries, while depreciating the English, "who confident of their own strength and the natural defence of the sea, despising all rules and condemning their wisdom and virtue, have by degrees imbraced the imperfections and vices of all other nations, the pride of the Grecians, the luxury of the Romans, the intemperance of the Peloponnesians, the levity of the Sicilians<sup>2</sup> and in conclusion whatever may render them contemptible or contribute to their own ruin." England lost the gains of the early French wars, had internal contests between king and nobles, and the Wars of the Roses between two princely houses; "but not to be tedious," Synesius says, "the publick affairs have been still swayed by the interests or inclinations of particular persons," of whom Somerset neglected the interests of England for Scotland; Buckingham was jealous of all men except the most submissive; Stafford laid new foundations; and Laud built on quicksands. "Thus what one built, another presently destroyed," and so the country, being subordinated to personal interests, naturally became the prey of factions and discontents.

Finally, on the political side, arises the question of what to do in the crisis of affairs in 1645. The kingly dignity and power has been brought low. Essex has left the Parliamentary forces, but Coroastus (Cromwell) is now leading them. Prince Charles, in the story, intimates a desire to come to terms with Cromwell, and Synesius acknowledges that that would be well, for Cromwell is frank, and his followers are of more integrity than the Scotch or the party of Essex. But as Cromwell is firm in his purpose and has a strong army, he probably would not abandon his chances of success, especially as he holds London with all its wealth. The

<sup>2</sup> He means the French, altho he twice calls them Sicilians.

question then is, where shall the Royalists get aid? Not from Spain, for she has suffered "so many pointed affronts"; not from France, or any foreign power. The obvious thing is, therefore, a reconciliation with Essex and his party. "They can be trusted, for they know that if you receive them not into favor, they are absolutely ruined." Having received this advice from Synesius, Prince Charles admits its worth, and says, "I confess myself vanquished, and furnished with these reasons shall easily induce the King to imbrace your advice."

These are the subjects of the political discussion. They are interesting in themselves, but there are two other important points. These are the question of the date of the book, and that of the Essex-Elizabeth ring-story.

The date of *Theophania* on all copies with a title-page is 1655, but the publisher in his preface vaguely suggests the possibility of its having been written earlier. The tone and the facts suggest an earlier date. In the first place, King Antiochus (Charles I) is mentioned several times as being alive. For instance, Prince Charles says (page 28), "have not the sufferings of my royal parents satisfied your wrath? Will you still persecute them?" And again, "Heap affliction upon my parents, deprive them of their Empire, and me of my succession." On page 99 Synesius says, "But you will never be able to divert that torrent of confusion which threatens the total subversion of this flourishing monarchy." It is evident then that the book was written while the King was still alive, therefore, before January, 1649.

The fact that the Civil War is called the "Seven Years War" might incline one to the opinion that 1649, seven years from the outbreak in 1642, was meant; but if the troubles of England are dated from the first outbreak in Scotland in 1638, then the date is thrown back to 1645. This agrees with the opinion given of Cromwell, for he is spoken of as rising (with his "new acquired greatness" after Essex's departure); and described in a friendly manner (page 187), for Prince Charles says,—he "cannot be truly said to rebel against the King"; "the frankness of his proceedings is so generous"; "I would rather to enjoy a divided Empire with him than be fully restored by the assistance of Cenodoxius." This, unless a hoax, throws new light on the early attitude of the Royalists towards Cromwell, and also serves to confirm the opinion

of the earlier date on the book. Finally, and most convincing, is the fact that there would have been no point to a large part of the book had not Essex been still living (he died in September, 1646); and had he not left the Parliamentary army, which he did in September, 1645. It can be asserted with reasonable confidence that the book was written towards the end of 1645. Whether it was examined then by the "respectable gentlemen," whom the publisher speaks of in his preface, or not, is unknown. Certainly it would have been very difficult for anyone, because of subsequent events, to write in the spirit of this book, for the attitude towards Cromwell and the facts themselves would all have changed.

If written in 1645, why was it not published till 1655? Was it a political pamphlet intended to strengthen the Royalist cause, which rapid changes or uncertainty of events made difficult or impossible of publication in 1645? Was it actually published in 1645, and was there another edition in 1655? Why was it published in 1655 at all, unless to discredit the Commonwealth, and if so, why was the pleasing characterization of Cromwell retained? These are questions which arise out of the book and make it of great interest.

The remaining point of interest is the ring-story. This comes in the life-tale of Heraclius, the first Earl of Essex, told by Cenodoxius, his son. Elizabeth gives the older Essex a ring, which he is to send to her whenever he is in trouble and she will save him, even his life (p. 120). After Essex has been to Ireland and comes back to England disgraced, he raises a small body of men, as is well known, to rescue Elizabeth from her advisers. He is charged with treason and condemned to death. He sends the ring (pp. 148-50) to Elizabeth by the Countess of Nottingham, who out of jealousy fails to deliver it, and Essex is executed. But remorse overcomes the Countess and on her deathbed, shortly afterwards, she sends for Elizabeth and tells her. Elizabeth, who had a real affection for Essex, is overcome by grief, and dies of a broken heart.

The ring-story has been worked out by Ranke (*History of England*, Oxford translation, I, 352-3) and by Brewer (*Quarterly Review*, 1876, I, 23; see *D. N. B.*, Robert Devereux). The first appearance of the story in its generally accepted form was about 1650, in the *History of the Most Renowned Queen Elizabeth and her Great Favourite, the Earl of Essex. In Two Parts. A Romance.*

It was repeatedly re-issued (fifteen editions to 1740), and John Banks dramatized it in *The Unhappy Favourite*. The important point is that if *Theophania* was written in 1645 as seems likely, then the ring story there was the earliest account. Whether the author of the above romance saw the manuscript of *Theophania* or knew its author, or whether the author of both pieces was the same, or whether the romance was published earlier, is still undetermined. It seems unlikely, however, that two different authors should have developed the same story independently.

This brings us to another point on which no final judgment can be rendered at present, and that is the possibility that Clarendon was the author of *Theophania*.<sup>3</sup> Clarendon says (*Life*, II, 69) that about this time (1643-6) he was writing a good deal of fugitive material including parodies. Very little of this has been identified as his. He began his *History* in 1646. Several passages read like similar passages in *Theophania* (thus, p. 200, the account of Armandus stirring up rebellion in Scotland; cf. *History*, Bk. IX, p. 748, Richelieu). Moreover, the political opinions with some exceptions (which are placed, however, in the mouths of different characters) agree with Clarendon's general position. In 1655, he was on the continent in exile and there was no reason why, if Thomas Heath, the publisher, wanted to publish a work by "An English Person of Quality" he should not do so. On the other hand, in "The Difference and Disparity between George Duke of Buckingham and Robert Earl of Essex" (*Reliquiae Wottonianae*, p. 184), Clarendon speaks more favorably of Elizabeth and says, "I am nothing satisfied with that loose report which hath crept into our discourse about the ring."

In conclusion then, this romance, which at first sight seemed so dull, is interesting enough and abounds in problems. It appears to be clear that it was written ten years before it was published, and that it contains the first account of the ring. There are some resemblances to Clarendon, tho it is far from being proved that he was the author.

AUGUSTUS HUNT SHEARER.

*The Newberry Library, Chicago, Ill.*

<sup>3</sup> Dr. T. C. Pease, of the University of Illinois, whose doctor's dissertation at the University of Chicago was on "The Levellers," has made this suggestion.

## GOETHE'S USE OF VERGAKELT

The discovery a few years ago at Zurich of a manuscript of *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*<sup>1</sup> was an important event not only from a literary but also from a philological point of view, inasmuch as it has added a very interesting document to the sources for the grammatical study of Goethe's language. The manuscript abounds in individual grammatical forms, and while we are not always certain that the anomaly belongs to Goethe and not to the two Swiss ladies who copied his manuscript, there remain enough instances in which there can be little doubt as to the correctness of the copy. Among the latter instances I should reckon the word *vergakelt*, found in the first and in the second chapter of the *Sendung*.<sup>2</sup> The fact that this word occurs—in the same spelling—in two different passages seems to preclude the suspicion of a clerical error, being at the same time a safeguard against possible misinterpretation.

The first passage reads:

“‘Sei nur stille,’ sagte die Alte, indem sie die Kleider der Puppen, die sich etwas verschoben hatten, zurecht rückte . . . ; ‘wie ihr klein, wart ihr immer drin vergakelt, und trugt euch mit euern Spiel- und Naschsachen herum die ganze Feiertage.’” (‘You’d better hold your tongue,’ said the old woman, while adjusting the dresses of the puppets which had become slightly disarranged . . . ; ‘when a child, you used to be infatuated with them and to carry about your toys and titbits with you throughout the holidays.’)

While *vergakelt* is here construed with the preposition *in* (*drin*) in the sense of ‘vernarrt in,’ it occurs without preposition and in a slightly different shade of meaning in the next chapter.

<sup>1</sup> Goethe, *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*. Mitteilungen über die wiedergefundene erste Fassung von W. Meisters Lehrjahren von G. Billeter. Zürich 1910.—*Goethes Werke*. Hrg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie v. Sachsen. Bd. 51 u. 52. Weimar, 1911.—Goethe, *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*. Nach der Schulthess'schen Abschrift hrsg. v. H. Mayne. Stuttgart u. Berlin (Cotta) 1911.

<sup>2</sup> Billeter, pp. 22 and 26.—*Goethes Werke*, vol. 51, pp. 5 and 9.—Mayne, pp. 2 and 6.—The two passages are also found in *Selections from Classical German Literature*, by Klara H. Collitz, New York, Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. 437 and 440.

"Dieser Aktus endigte sich. Die übrigen Kleinen waren alle vergakelt, Wilhelm allein erwartete das Folgende und sann darauf." (This act thus came to an end. While all the other children were in a trance, Wilhelm alone was waiting for the performance to be resumed and reflecting on its outcome.)

As shown especially by the contrast "Wilhelm allein erwartete . . . und sann," *vergakelt* apparently is used here as a synonym of 'bezaubert' or 'verzückt.' The state of mind of the majority of the children no doubt resembles the one described a few lines back by the verb *vergeistern*: "Der Hohepriester Samuel erschien mit Jonathan, und ihre wechselnde Stimmen vergeisterten ganz ihre kleine Zuschauer." Very likely their enthusiasm manifested itself even more plainly at the end of the act, so that *vergakelt* may be taken in the sense of 'närrisch' or 'von Sinnen.'

The word *vergakelt* is not recorded in our dictionaries. As far as I am aware it does not occur in German literature except in these two passages. We can hardly then accept it as a regular Modern German word. How did it find its way into Goethe's language? and what is the etymon?

The only attempt to answer these questions that has come to my notice is a brief reference in vol. 51 (p. 298) of the Weimar Goethe edition to the participle *gegäckelt*, used by Goethe in a letter to Frau von Stein: "Friz hat mich vor vieren geweckt und das neue Jahr herbey gegäckelt" (*Goethes Briefe*, Weimar edition, vol. iv, p. 1). Yet *gäckeln* and *gakeln* are obviously two different verbs. *Gegäckelt* in the letter to Frau v. Stein means 'geschwätzt' or 'geplappert.' Sanders in his *Wörterbuch* I, 529<sup>a</sup> no doubt is right in regarding Goethe's *gäckeln* as a by-form of Mod. Ger. *gackeln*, meaning (1) 'to cluck, cackle,' (2) 'to prattle, chatter.' The co-existence of the two present forms, the one without and the other with umlaut, has many parallels. Cf., e. g., Mod. Ger. *schwätzen* (M. H. G. *swatzen*) and *schwätzen* (M. H. G. *swetzen*) 'to prattle,' or Mod. Ger. *babbeln* (a variant of *plappern*) and Rhenish Prussian *bäbbeln*<sup>3</sup> 'to babble.'

If we agree to identify Goethe's *gäckeln* with Mod. Ger. *gackeln*, the gulf correspondingly widens—as regards both the form and the meaning—between this verb and the term *vergakelt*. The spelling

<sup>3</sup> "babele, auch bäbele, klatschen, schwätzen" Hoenig, *Wörterbuch der Kölner Mundart*, Köln, 1905, p. 11.



of the latter word seems to indicate that the stem vowel is long, and while the verb *gackeln* designates the utterance of sounds rather than the existence of thoughts, *vergakelt* clearly refers to a state of mind produced in exceptional circumstances. Inasmuch as it implies a contrast between every day life—or the regular course of human thoughts—and a mental condition out of the ordinary, it reminds us of certain Modern German words implying a similar contrast between reality—or common experience—and visions due to artificial means or belonging to an imaginary world, such as *Gaukler*, a synonym of 'Zauberer, Jahrmarktskünstler, Taschenspieler,' and *Gaukelei*, meaning 'Zauberei, Blendwerk, Narrenspossen.' Is *vergakelt* then perhaps connected with the Modern German verb *gaukeln* 'to juggle, delude'? Taking it for granted that the meaning of the word admits this suggestion, it remains to be shown that in Goethe's language (or let us say at once, in Goethe's dialect) the vowel *ā* (i. e., long *a*) may replace the Modern German diphthong *au*.

The substitution of this *ā* for the old <sup>4</sup> diphthong *au* is characteristic of the Bavarian and of several Central German—especially Rhinefrancian and Eastfrancian—dialects. A detailed delineation of the area in which this vowel-change occurs, may be found in one of Wrede's reports on Wenker's *Sprachatlas des Deutschen Reiches*, in the *Anz. f. dt. Alt.* XXIII (1897), 209 and 217 and XXIV, 123. As regards the district from the Siegerland to the Vogelsberg, Wrede's statements were revised by E. Maurmann, "Zur Verbreitung von *ā* für wgerm. *au* = ahd. *ou*" (*Zs. f. dt. Mundarten* hrsg. v. O. Heilig u. H. Teuchert, 1913, p. 193). The region in which this *ā* is met with includes the city of Frankfurt on the Main. The noun 'Auge,' e. g., is in Frankfurt pronounced *Aag*, pl. *Ääge* (see A. Askenasy, *Die Frankfurter Mundart u. ihre Literatur*, Frankf. a. M. 1904, p. 159), 'Baum' is changed to *Baam*, pl. *Bääm* (e. g., *Kerschbaam* p. 90, *Aepfelbääm* p. 135), 'taub' appears as *daab*, 'Frau' as *Fraa* (ib. p. 160), etc.

The form then in which we might expect to find the Mod. Ger. *gaukeln*, if preserved in this dialect, would be *gaakeln*. As a mat-

<sup>4</sup> By the "old" diphthong *au* we understand the one corresponding to Gothic and Westgermanic *au* in distinction from the New High German *au* developed from earlier *ū* in words like *aus*, *Bräut*, *Gaul*, *Haus*, *Mauer*, *Maul*, *sauer*, etc.

ter of fact, this very verb, together with the noun *Gaakeleie*, has survived in Frankfurt to this day, and the identity of these words with Mod. Ger. *gaukeln* and *Gaukelei*, although apparently not yet noticed, is so evident as to leave no room for any doubt. I shall quote again from Askenasy, *Die Frankfurter Mundart*:

(1) P. 217: "*gaakele* (Spass machen) *mit de Määd gaakele* Fries, *St. A. S. 6*."

The reference is to the historical comedy "Das Studenten-Attentat 1833" by Joh. Jac. Fries (in *Altfrankfurter humoristisch-historische Sittenbilder in dramat. Form* von Johann Jacobus. Frankf. a. M. 1899).—For the interpretation 'Spass machen' we may substitute, without altering the sense, 'Narrheit treiben' ('to fool') in the sense of 'to jest' or 'to joke.'—The words *mit de Määd* of course mean 'with the girls.'

(2) P. 72: "die Mädchen dürfen keine *Gaakeleie* (Fries, *Rev. S. 162*) treiben und müssen ruhig an ihrem *Fleissklingel* arbeiten."

The reference here is to the comedy *Die Revolution 1848* by the same author and found in the same collection (*Altfrankfurter humoristisch-histor. Sittenbilder*).—*Gaakeleie* may be translated by 'Narrheit' ('tomfoolery').

Was Goethe aware of the fact that he was using a dialectal form when he employed the term *vergakelt* in his first draft of *Wilhelm Meister*? In other words, was he aware of the connection of the verb *gakeln* with High German *gaukeln*? The answer must be in the negative, for the reason that Goethe uses the regular Modern German form alongside of the one belonging to the Frankfurt dialect. In the second chapter of the *Sendung*, on the same page on which the word *vergakelt* is found, we read: "Wilhelm aber geriet in eine Nachdenklichkeit, darüber er das Ballet von Mohren und Mohrinnen, Schäfern und Schäferinnen, Zwergen und Zwerginnen nur wie im Schatten vor sich hingaukeln sah."

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Johns Hopkins University.

## SPENSERIANA: THE LAY OF CLORINDA

In the one-volume Oxford Spenser (p. xxxv), Ernest de Sélin-court suggests, for the first time I believe, that the *Lay of Clorinda* commonly attributed to the Countess of Pembroke is in fact Spenser's, "that Spenser wrote it in her name." This conclusion I had reached some years since, and now wish to confirm with further observations. Sélincourt rests the case solely on its "peculiarly Spenserian effects of rhythm and melody"—he does not descend to instances,—and on the fact that it is "woven into the plan of the volume, and not a separate work standing by itself, like those that follow." If Sélincourt's suggestion is to carry conviction, it would seem in need of further development.

The *Lay* is in fact introduced very much as are certain short poems incidental to the *Shepherd's Calendar*, namely, the plaints in the eclogues for August and November, and the song to Eliza in that for April. At the end, two stanzas without change of metre introduce the Alexandrines of Ludovic Bryskett. From what precedes it is separated, not by title or pagination, but solely by an ornamental capital and band. The following lines serve as transition:—

But first his sister that *Clorinda* hight  
..... began this dolefull lay.  
Which least I marre the sweetnesse of the vearse,  
In sort as she it sung, I will rehearse.

These lines constitute, I believe, the only evidence—certainly ambiguous evidence—that Lady Pembroke wrote the *Lay*. I think, however, it is demonstrable that she did not.

Spenser's *Astrophel* and the *Lay*, which are thus linked, are composed in the same sestet, riming ABABCC. In each case, furthermore, the second line usually ends in a colon. The *Lay* offers eleven instances in sixteen stanzas, while in four of the remaining five lines an interrogation point forbade it. *Astrophel* offers thirty-four instances in thirty-nine stanzas. (I use the text of B. M. 11536, since Sélincourt's text offers seven of these colons in *Astrophel*.) Such a resemblance can hardly be fortuitous. That it is no accident of publication or caprice becomes certain from the facts that in the one hundred sestets (ABABCC) of *The Teares of the Muses* it occurs but three times; in the *Elegie* of thirty-nine

stanzas following *Astrophel* it occurs but three times. Similarly a colon after the second line almost never appears in Spenser's sonnets except in the *Amoretti*, where it marks seventy of the eighty-nine.

This metrical similarity indicates that the *Lay* is an integral part of *Astrophel*, interwoven just as Spenser interweaves the lament of Alcyon in *Daphnida* (197-539). There feignedly a husband, as here a sister, mourns the deceased. If it be objected that he definitely attributes the *Lay* to Sidney's sister, no less so does he attribute the *Daphnida* complaint of seven times seven stanzas to Arthur Georges. Witness *Colin Clout* (384-7):—

And there is sad Alcyon bent to mourne,  
Though fit to frame an euerlasting dittie,  
Whose gentle spright for Daphne's death doth tourn  
Sweet lays of loue to endless plaints of pittie.

These circumstances by themselves do, indeed, admit of the interpretation that Spenser in writing *Astrophel* conformed to the style of Lady Pembroke's *Lay*. And it is clear that the *Lay* preceded *Astrophel* in composition—if we may trust Spenser's words. In *The Ruines of Time* (316-9) occurs an allusion to the *Lay*:—

But who can better sing,  
Than thine owne sister, peerless Ladie bright,  
Which to thee [Sidney] sings with deep harts sorrowing . . .

Shortly after, in his dedicatory epistle to this poem, addressed to Lady Pembroke, Spenser states that he has been reproached for suffering his patrons' names "to sleep in silence and forgetfulness," and has therefore composed *The Ruines of Time*. This apology has naturally been taken to imply that he had as yet written nothing in memory of Sidney, and therefore that *Astrophel* is of subsequent composition. It does not, however, forbid his having written for the Countess the *Lay* in question, except that his praise of it (319-22) becomes sly self-praise.

Return to the colon: we may be sure that Spenser did not adopt it from the Countess. It is an old device in Spenser, found in the same stanza in 1579, as in the January and December eclogues. In January it serves for nine of thirteen stanzas; in December, for nineteen of twenty-six. The October eclogue presents it in fifteen of twenty.

One may go so far as to say that Spenser, feigning himself in the shepherd Colin, uses this device as a trademark of Colin. Where it appears in January and December, Colin speaks. It appears where his songs are sung: in the April lay eight times of thirteen; in the November lament ten times of fifteen. It is begun in Colin's lament in the August eclogue, but not continued—probably because of the difficulty of including it in a sestina. It is often carried into Colin's speeches in *Colin Clout* (101, 292, 465, 621, 687, 750, 928). The one marked exception occurs in October, where Piers and Cuddie use it regularly. But even here E. K. declares in his gloss: "I doubte whether by Cuddie be specified the author selfe, or some other."

Apart from this detail, several specific features serve to link *Astrophel* and the *Lay*. *Astrophel* is addressed to "shepheards"; the *Lay* to "shepheards lasses" (37). Each treats at length of the flower *Astrophel* (mentioned elsewhere by Spenser only, and only in Aleyon's lament in *Daphnida* 346). And certain lines, not striking out of their context, present in the reading marked parallels: (1) "dearest unto mee" *Astr.* 150; "greatest losse to mee" *Lay* 36; (2) "Merrily masking" *Astr.* 28; "Your mery maker" *Lay* 48; (3) "layes of love" *Astr.* 35; "such layes of love" *Lay* 44. However insignificant alone, these help to clinch the matter.

We know that the practice was not new, but was common, for poets to write verses to bear their patrons' names. Therefore, even if the *Lay* at first circulated in manuscript as Lady Pembroke's,—and we have no assurance that it did,—still this is not inconsistent with Spenser's authorship. And to suppose her authorship forces an assumption that Lady Pembroke appropriated this trick of punctuation and sentence structure which Spenser had made distinctively Colin's. Note, moreover, that in the *Lay* Colin allegedly still speaks; for he says:—

In sort as she it sung, I will rehearse.

Will anyone versed in Elizabethan letters hazard an hypothesis that Spenser revised into a distinctive form an earlier poem actually composed by Lady Pembroke? *Ce ne vaut pas la peine*.

To some, I hope, the line of argument followed above will appear superfluous. It should be sufficient to elaborate a little on the argument which Sélincourt might readily have developed, that

Lady Pembroke could hardly have achieved such characteristically Spenserian effects, as for instance the following lines (*Lay* 61-4):

But that immortall spirit, which was deckt  
With all the dowries of celestiall grace:  
By soueraine choyce from the heuenly quires select,  
And lineally deriu'd from Angells race . . . .

The æsthetic critic, especially if a Platonist, should compare with this Spenser's sonnet to the Countess in memory of her brother, or *The Ruines of Time* (281-9). He will not be unrewarded. They contrast clearly with the lame imitation of Colin's style offered by Spenser's friend Bryskett in his ensuing *Pastorall Aeglogue*. Indeed, one cannot read the passages side by side without concluding that if Lady Pembroke wrote the *Lay*, she has come measurably nearer imitating Spenser than did such passionate admirers of his verse as Shelley or Keats.

PERCY W. LONG.

Harvard University.

---

#### ANGLO-SAXON *UMBOR* AND *SELD-GUMA*

The Anglo-Saxon noun *umbor* occurs in a semi-Malthusian passage in the gnomic verses of the Exeter Book (line 31), and twice (in composition) in *Beowulf*: 46, *umbor-wesende*; 1188, *umbor-wesendum*. This list of occurrences is not to be increased by Otto Schlotterose's conjectured *fugel-umber* (for *fugel-timber*, *Phœnix* 236; *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik* xxv, 26, 62).

The undisputed meaning of *umbor* is 'child.' This is clear in each occurrence of the word, and it is supported by the alternative compound *cniht-wesende*, which is also found in the prose (*Engl. Stud.* XLII, 321). Heyne, however, in the early editions of his *Beowulf* kept on questioning the meaning, and Nathaniel Müller (*Die Mythen im Beowulf*, Leipzig, 1878, 6 f.) contended for an identification with Scandinavian *ôborni* (cf. Icel. *ú-borinn*, 'unborn'), deducing a specialized meaning to fit his interpretation of the mythical history of Scyld in the opening passage of *Beowulf*. The inevitable 'first thought' that the second syllable of *umbor* may connect the word with the verb *beran* antedates Müller, and survives to this day in the definition 'Neugeborner,' adopted by Holthausen (*Beowulf*, II. Teil, 1906).



There is another line of transmission in the suggested etymological definitions of *umbor*. In the Glossary to his edition of *Beowulf* (1875), Thorpe repeated the question (presumably from Ettmüller, p. 44) of the possible relation of *umbor* to *ympe*, 'graft, shoot,' and regarded the word as "of similar formation to *lambor*, *hālor*, etc." This view is favored and set forth in detail by Leo (*Angelsächsisches Glossar*, 1877). Since Leo's time the development of *-es*, *-os* stems has come to be better understood, and the morphological presumption against his argument is conclusive. It must be admitted, however, that the word *imp* did in later times take on the figurative sense of 'child' [see *NED.*].

The etymological explanation of *umbor* now submitted for consideration has not, so far as I know, been suggested hitherto. It can be stated in the formula *æf: eafora* = \**umb* (*ymbe*, *ymb*): *umbor*.

In this connection it will be kept in mind that the preposition *ymb* (*ymbe*) has often been mistranslated. Altho Ettmüller (p. 48) recognized the signification 'post, after,' Sweet, for example, failed in successive editions of his *Anglo-Saxon Reader* to define it correctly in certain 'phrases of time,' which may be illustrated by *þæs ymb III niht hīe gefuhton* etc.: *tertio post pugnam die* etc. (*Orosius*, 246, 5); *ymb VII wintra ond ymb lýtne ēacon* (*id.*, 252, 19); *ymbe gēares ryne* (*id.*, 248, 16); *ymb āne niht* (*Beowulf*, 135). But this matter is surveyed by Sievers (*Beiträge* XXIX, 323 f.), and of special importance in this discussion is his statement: "Für eigentlich lebendig kann also offenbar nur die bedeutung 'nach' dienen." The meaning 'after' is thus established, especially for Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon, as that which should be effective in a derivative from the radical syllable of *ymbe*.

It may be thought that a difficulty is encountered in obtaining the basic form \**umb* assumed in the suggested derivation of *umbor*; but an investigation of Johannes Schmidt (*K.Z.* XXVI, 37 f.) sufficiently warrants this assumption.

The conclusion, therefore, is that *umbor*, 'child, offspring, descendant,' is derived from \**umb*, 'after, post' (cf. Lat. *posteri*; German *Nachkomme*) just as *eafora* (*u*, *o* umlaut, *Engl. Stud.* XXX, 270; cf. O.S. *abaro*, Noreen, *Abriss der germ. Lautlehre*, 124) is derived from *æf* (accented form of *of*). Altho in theme-formation *umbor* does not follow *eafora*, it is in close agreement with two other words of like meaning, namely, *tūdor* and *wōcor*.

The warden of the coast, greeting Beowulf and his company, refers specifically to Beowulf in the words 'one of you is a more distinguished warrior than I have ever before seen; if his incomparable appearance does not misrepresent him, he is not a mere *seld-guma*' (l. 249). That is, according to the commentators, he is not a mere hall-man, retainer, henchman; or stay-at-home, carpet-knight; or, finally, peasant, who possesses only a *seld* (i. e. a poor dwelling, or a small plot of ground), "Mann niedrigen Standes."

This diversity of suggested meanings, however, leaves the epithet *seld-guma* still in doubt, for the most probable of these suggestions, 'retainer,' is not suitable in this particular application, and by implication it puts a depressed estimation upon the rank of a social-military class that is always highly honored in epic usage. On the other hand, the meanings that have been less favored by editors and translators, these, I hold, are set aside by the fact that both in simple form and in composition the English *seld* does not agree in specialized significations with the German *selde*. This is made strikingly manifest by the absence in English of compounds that would correspond to the German *seldmann*, *selmann*, *seldner*, 'bewohner, besitzer eines als *seld* bezeichneten gebäudes oder gutes'; and *selden-gut*, *selden-hof*, 'kleines, meist selbständiges bauergut' (Grimm's *Wörterbuch*).

To come at once to the point, a slight change in the text of *Beowulf* will make it clear that this unique occurrence of *seld-guma* offers no difficulty. By reading *Is* (for MS. *Nis*) *þæt seld-guma*, the meaning of the epithet becomes fittingly 'seldom, rare, superior man, *vir nimis egregius*.' This is in accord with the known compounds of *seld-* in Anglo-Saxon, *seld-cūð*, 'seldom known, wonderful'; *seld-cyme*, 'a rare visit'; *seld-siene*, 'seldom seen, uncommon,' etc.; and it is in accord with the tradition by which words of this type were kept alive, and which made possible such words of later periods as *seld-speech*, *seld-time*, *seld-known*, etc. [see *NED*.].

Kemble made an approach to the right understanding of the passage when he recorded "*seld, raro*" in his glossary, but *nis* of the context diverted him into a curiously impossible rendering: "That man is not one seldom dignified in feats of arms."

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

## ZUR SYNTAX DES VERBUMS MEINEN IM ALTHOCH- DEUTSCHEN

In dem Monseer Bruchstücke *De Vocatione Gentium* (xxviii, 17-18) kommt das Zeitwort *meinit* in der 3. pers. sg. vor: *Et ita in illo primo mandato dei, de quo in euangelio interroganti se respondens dominus ait; Enti so sama in demo eristin gotes gabote in gotspelle meinit daz fragentemo (Hs. fangentemo) sih truhtin antuurta, quad.* Es fragt sich nun, ob man *meinit* hier als persönliches Zeitwort, dessen Subjekt aus dem folgenden Nebensatz zu verstehen ist, oder als unpersönliches Zeitwort mit ausgelassenem Subjekt (*iz*) auffassen sollte. In der Ausgabe von Endlicher und Hoffmann (*Fragmenta Theotisca*, Viennae, 1841) wird *meinit* hier als persönliches Zeitwort aufgefasst, indem es das lateinische *ait* (*Vokab.*, S. 41, *meinit, ait*, 28, 18) wiedergeben soll. Das ist nun offenbar falsch, da *quad* das lateinische *ait* wiedergibt, während *meinit* die Verbalidee ausdrückt, welche im lateinischen *ita in illo primo mandato dei* zu verstehen ist. Das Verbum substantivum (*esse*), welches hier wie oft im Lateinischen nicht ausgedrückt ist, wird öfters in den ahd. Übersetzungen durch das unpersönliche Zeitwort *meinit* vertreten (vgl. unten). *Meinit* ist hier also als unpersönlich mit zu ergänzendem Subjekt (*iz*) aufzufassen, während der folgende Nebensatz (*daz fragentemo sih truhtin antuurta*) als dessen Objekt anzusehen ist. Nach *meinit* steht das demonstrativ-relative Pronomen (*daz*) in Apokoinou-Konstruktion als Objekt sowohl von *meinit* als auch von *antuurta*. Die ahd. Übersetzung heisst dann buchstäblich: "Und auf gleiche Weise im ersten Gebot Gottes in der Heiligen Schrift heisst es, nämlich, was der Herr demjenigen antwortete und sprach, welcher ihn fragte." *So sama . . . meinit* heisst 'gleichfalls heisst es' 'es bezeichnet dasselbe,' 'es hat dieselbe Bedeutung,' nämlich die Liebe (*charitas*, I. Kor. XIII), wovon die Rede ist. Zwar kommt das ahd. *meinen* mit persönlichem Subjekt<sup>1</sup> im Sinne von 'meinen,' 'sagen,' sehr häufig vor, aber an der betreffenden Stelle kann von persönlichem Subjekt keine Rede sein, da das fehlende Subjekt nicht aus dem

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. Otfrid I, 3, 31, *ih meuin sancta mariun*, III, 7, 33, *thie fisga zeinent*, *uuaz forasagon meinent*, und Isidor XIV, 15, *et filium et patrem ostendit*, *chiiuissio meinida ir dhar sunu endi fater*.

folgenden Nebensatz gefolgert werden darf (vgl. unten). Das Subjekt muss also unpersönlich sein, und daher muss *meinit* als unpersönliches Zeitwort mit zu ergänzendem Subjekt aufgefasst werden. *Meinit* heisst dann ' (es) bezeichnet, bedeutet, heisst.'

Dieser unpersönliche Gebrauch von *meinen* mit dem Akkusativ kommt besonders häufig in den Monseer Bruchstücken, seltener aber bei Otfrid vor. Otfrid hat z. B. nur II, 4, 63, *iz meinit hiar then gotes drût*, welches offenbar das Lateinische des Hrabanus Maurus (in Matth. 22) *de viro sancto prophetia est* wiedergibt. In der Isidorübersetzung hingegen (Henchs Ausgabe, *Quellen und Forsch.* LXXII, Strassburg, 1893) kommt das unpersönliche *meinit* öfters auch mit fehlendem Subjekt (*izs*) vor, da es bei den unpersönlichen Verben im Ahd. überhaupt nicht notwendig war, das Subjekt auszudrücken: z. B. xv, 18, *ecce tria, see hear meinit nu dhri*, XLIII, 16 *Hic locus in hebreo habet, Dheasa stat auh meinit in dhemu ebræischin chiscribe*. Hier ist der ahd. Übersetzer vom lateinischen Vorbild insoweit syntaktisch abgewichen, als er die im Lateinischen persönliche Konstruktion (*ecce (sunt) tria, hic locus —habet*) durch eine im Deutschen unpersönliche (d. h. *meinit* mit dem Akkusativ) wiedergegeben hat. An allen diesen Stellen regiert *meinit* den Akkusativ, obgleich das Lateinische einen anderen Kasus dafür verlangt: *drût* (akk. = *viro sancto*, abl.), *dhri* (akk. = Lat. *tria*, nom.), *dheasa stat* (akk. = Lat. *hic locus*, nom.).

Ebenso muss *meinit* an der betreffenden Stelle des Traktates *De Vocatione Gentium* als unpersönliches Zeitwort mit *daz* als direktem Objekt aufgefasst werden. Der Nebensatz *daz—truhtin antuurta* ('das, was der Herr antwortete') steht dann gleichfalls als Objekt von *meinit*, indem *daz* diesen Nebensatz einleitet. Letzteres steht also in Apokoinou-Konstruktion als Objekt sowohl von *meinit* als auch von *antuurta*.

Ein syntaktisch etwas ähnliches Verhältnis liegt in der Isidorübersetzung (v, 10) vor. Hier kommt der Infinitiv *meinan* in indirekter Rede vor. Das Subjekt (*izs*) fehlt und das Zeitwort regiert, wie in den obigen Fällen, den Akkusativ. Is. v, 10, *Dum enim audis deum unctum, intellege christum, Dhar dhu chihoris umbi dhen chisalbodon got meinan, ziware firnim dhanne dhaz dhar ist christ chizeichnet*. *Got* steht nicht als Subjekt, sondern als Objekt von *meinan*, dessen Subjekt (*izs*) fehlt. Der Infinitiv ist also als unpersönlich aufzufassen, so dass er für die 3. Person

ind. sg. (*got* acc.) *meinit* (d. h. 'es wird Gott bezeichnet,' 'es bedeutet dasselbe als Gott mit Rücksicht auf den Gesalbten' = 'mit dem Gesalbten wird Gott gemeint') der direkten Rede steht. Derselbe Gedanke wird in der nächsten Zeile durch *zeihnan* persönlich ausgedrückt; *dhar ist christ chizeihnit*. *Dhar meinit christ* (acc.) und *dhar ist christ* (nom.) *chizeihnit* bedeutet ja ein und dasselbe.

An der betreffenden Stelle des Monseer Bruchstückes *De Vocatione Gentium* darf man *meinit* aus zwei Gründen nicht als persönliches Zeitwort auffassen; nämlich (1) weil der Übersetzer keinen Grund hatte, das lateinische *ait* zweimal (*meinit*, *quad*) wiederzugeben, und (2) weil sich ein Pronomen<sup>2</sup> im Ahd. niemals auf ein erst nachher genanntes Subjekt bezieht.<sup>3</sup> Wenn der Übersetzer auch das lateinische *ait* zweimal hätte wiedergeben wollen, so hätte er doch keinen Grund gehabt, dafür im Deutschen verschiedene Tempora (vgl. *meinit*, präs., aber *quad*, prät.) zu wählen. Vielmehr bezieht sich *meinit* auf das gegenwärtige Thema der Predigt, während sich *quad* offenbar auf die historische Vergangenheit (d. h. auf die Worte Christi) bezieht. Es ist weiter falsch ein sich auf *truhtin* beziehendes Personalpronomen (*ir*) als fehlendes Subjekt von *meinit* anzunehmen, da sich ein Pronomen im Ahd. niemals auf ein erst nachher genanntes Subjekt bezieht (vgl. oben Fussn. 3).

<sup>2</sup> Wenn man das Zeitwort *meinit* als persönlich auffasst, so muss man hier ein unausgedrücktes pronominales Subjekt annehmen, welches sich auf das folgende *truhtin* beziehen würde.

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. Kögel's Bemerkung zu dem *Georgslied*, Z. 17, in seiner *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters*, Strassburg, 1894, I, S. 100. Die ahd. Regel, dass sich ein Pronomen nie auf ein erst nachher genanntes Subjekt beziehen darf, gilt auch im Altnordischen (vgl. M. Nygaard, *Norroen Syntax*, Kristiania, 1905. §10, 11, 12 ff.) und im Altsächsischen (vgl. Otto Behaghel, *Die Syntax des Heliand*, Leipzig, 1897. §433-442).

In diesen beiden Dialekten darf das pronominale Subjekt nicht aus dem erst nachher Genannten gefolgert werden, daher kann sich das Subjekt auch nicht auf das erst nachher Genannte beziehen. Zwar folgt zuweilen im Altsächsischen bei mehreren an einander angereihten Hauptsätzen das Subjekt dem zweiten Verbum, aber dann ist beim ersten kein pronominales Subjekt ausgelassen, sondern das Subjekt des zweiten Verbums ist auch zugleich Subjekt des ersten, z. B. H. 1075 *tho bigan eft niuson endi nahor geng unhiuri fiund*. Dasselbe gilt auch vom Objekt, z. B. H. 2185 *carode endi cumde iro Kindes dod* (vgl. nhd., wir trafen und erquickten den Menschen, da gingen und sprachen wir).

Dagegen ist das Subjekt von *quad* ausgelassen, weil dasselbe (*truhtin*) schon im *vorigen* Nebensatze ausgedrückt war.

Um den Sinn der Stelle deutlicher und anschaulicher zu machen, benutzte der Übersetzer das unpersönliche *meinit* anstatt des Verbums substantivum, welches im Lateinischen oft fehlt: *ita (est) in illo primo mandato dei, so sama . . . meinit*, gerade so wie in der Isidorübersetzung v, 10, *Dum audis deum unctum (esse)*, *Dhar dhu chihoris . . . got meinan*; xv, 18, *ecce tria (sunt)*, *see hiar meinit nu dhri*, und bei Otfrid II, 4, 63 *de viro sancto prophetia est, iz meinit hiar then gotes drût*.

Selbst das persönliche *meinen* führt der Übersetzer, wo er die Stelle etwas klarer auslegen will, ohne lateinisches Vorbild willkürlich ein: z. B. Is. XXII, 15, *Paruolus enim christus quia homo, meinida dher forasago chiuuissio in dheru christes lyuzilun*, und auch Notker (Ps. 25), *ut audiam vocem laudis tuae, daz ich kehôre, ICH MEINO, daz ih ferneme unde bechenne die stimma dînes lobes*.

Ferner war es im Ahd. überhaupt nicht notwendig, das *iz* als Subjekt der unpersönlichen Verba auszudrücken. Einige unpersönliche Verba kommen sogar niemals mit *iz* vor (vgl. *gilustit*).<sup>4</sup> Auch bei denjenigen persönlichen Verben, welche ein unbestimmtes Subjekt verlangen, wird das Subjekt oft nicht ausgedrückt. Diese Neigung findet man besonders stark in der Isidorübersetzung. Als Überschrift des Kapitels fügt der Übersetzer oft ein *Hear quhidit umbi* oder *huueo* (vgl. IV, 1; XIII, 4; XXI, 15) willkürlich hinzu, wo das lateinische Vorbild nur den Titel hat. *Hear quhidit umbi* heisst 'hier spricht man über . . .', 'hier wird besprochen.' Die Auslassung des unbestimmten Subjektes bei diesem persönlichen Verbum ist nun der Auslassung des Subjektes bei dem unpersönlichen *meinit* ganz analog, nur dass im ersteren Fall eine Person (vgl. Nhd. *man*), im letzteren dagegen das unpersönliche *izs* als Subjekt zu verstehen ist. Im ersteren Fall (*hear quhidit*) setzt die Verbalhandlung irgend welche Person als Handelnden voraus, während im letzteren das Verbum unpersönlich ist, d. h. ein Verbum, dessen Subjektsnominativ entweder eine Sache als Träger der Handlung andeutet, oder als bloss formale Ergänzung des Satzes aufgefasst werden darf. Dass dieses *quhidit*, sowohl als

<sup>4</sup>Vgl. Erdmanns Ausgabe von Otfrid (Halle, 1882), S. 335, Note zu I, 1, 10<sup>b</sup>. Ferner Erdmanns *Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax*, Stuttgart, 1886, I, §6.



*meinit*, mit zu ergänzendem Subjekt dem ahd. Sprachgebrauch gemäss war, beweist die Tatsache, dass dieselben vom lateinischen Vorbilde unabhängig vorliegen. Für das lateinische Verbum substantivum benutzt der Übersetzer auch das persönliche *quhedan*, lässt aber dessen unbestimmtes Subjekt aus; so z. B. II, 12, *Hinc est et illud in libro iob, Umbi dhazs selba quhad auh in iobes boohhum*. Die ahd. Übersetzung heisst dann, 'über dasselbe sprach man auch im Buche Hiob,' 'das wurde auch in dem Buche Hiob besprochen.'

Solche persönlichen Verba, die ein unbestimmtes Pronominalsubjekt verlangen, wie *quhedan* bei Isidor, sind also mit den unpersönlichen Verben insoweit verwandt, als das Subjekt des Verbums in beiden Fällen unbestimmt ist. Daher fehlt wohl oft in beiden Fällen<sup>5</sup> das Subjekt, weil die Verbalform ohne ausgedrücktes Subjekt an und für sich genügt, um das Subjekt zu bezeichnen. Das war aber nicht der Fall bei den persönlichen Verben mit bestimmtem Pronominalsubjekt. Da musste das Pronominalsubjekt entweder ausgedrückt oder aus dem *vorher* Genannten verstanden werden, sonst war die Verbalform bei diesen Verben nicht an und für sich genügend, um das Subjekt zu bezeichnen (vgl. Erdmanns *Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax*, I, § 5). Bei Otfrid zwar findet man diese Regel oft durchbrochen, aber das kann man der poetischen Freiheit zuschreiben, die an einem viel älteren (dem Gotischen entsprechenden) Zustand der Sprache festhält. In der ahd. Prosa galt diese Regel auch viel früher als bei Otfrid, in den Monseer Bruchstücken.

Da nun die Auslassung des Subjektes sowohl bei den persönlichen Verben, welche ein unbestimmtes Pronominalsubjekt verlangen, als bei allen unpersönlichen Verben regelmässig stattfinden durfte, so liegt im Ahd. die Gefahr desto näher, das persönliche *meinen* mit dem unpersönlichen *meinen* zu verwechseln. Das ist jedenfalls, was sich Endlicher und Hoffmann an der betreffenden Stelle des Traktates *De Vocatione Gentium* haben zu schulden kommen lassen.

<sup>5</sup> Ebenso fällt im Altnordischen (vgl. Nygaard, §15, 16) sowohl das unbestimmte als das unpersönliche pronominale Subjekt oft aus, Z. B. OH. 233, 29 *svá segir í Tryggva flokki* = so erzählt man in dem 'Flokkr' über Olaf Tryggvason, welches dem ahd. (Isidor II, 12) *umbi dhazs selba quhad auh in iobes boohhum* in dieser Beziehung genau entspricht (vgl. auch *hér getr þess* = hier erzählt man, was so oft in den Sagen vorkommt, mit dem *Hear quhidit umbi* oder *huueo* des Isidor (IV, I. XIII, 4. XXI, 15).

Man beachte auch, dass das unpersönliche Subjekt *iz* nur da vorkommt, wo dem Verbum kein Teil des Prädikates voransteht; eine Neigung, die sich bei den unpersönlichen Verben auch im Nhd. stark merken lässt. Otfrid hat z. B., II, 4, 63, *iz meinit hiar then gotes drût*, Isidor aber xv, 18, *Sec hear meinit nu dhri*, und XLIII, 16, *Dheasa stat auh meinit in dhemu . . .* An der betreffenden Stelle des Traktates *De Vocatione Gentium* steht ein beträchtlicher Teil des Prädikates dem Verbum voran, *Enti so sama in demo eristin gotes gabote in gotspelle meinit daz . . .*

Ferner darf man das dem Verbum gleich folgende *daz* nicht als bestimmtes Subjekt von *meinit* auffassen. Zwar steht *daz* manchmal als Subjekt von *meinit*, aber dann darf das Objekt desselben nicht fehlen, weil *meinen* ein transitives Zeitwort ist und den Akkusativ verlangt; wie z. B. bei Otfrid V, 1, 26, *nim gouma, uuaz thaz meinit*. Hier steht *thaz* als Subjekt, *uuaz* aber als Objekt von *meinit*. An der betreffenden Stelle des Traktates *De Vocatione Gentium* konnte *daz* nicht zu gleicher Zeit sowohl als Subjekt wie als Objekt desselben Zeitwortes dienen. Das anzunehmen, ist umso weniger nötig, als *meinit*, wie oben gezeigt, so oft als unpersönliches Zeitwort vorkommt. Das Natürlichste ist also, *meinit* als unpersönliches Zeitwort mit ausgelassenem Subjekt (*iz*) aufzufassen, gerade wie an den schon oben erwähnten Stellen der Isidorübersetzung. Dann steht *daz* in Apokoinou-Konstruktion als Objekt sowohl von *meinit* als auch von *antuurta*. Das unpersönliche *meinit*, sowohl als das persönliche *quhedan* mit unbestimmtem Pronominalsubjekt, liegt besonders häufig in der Isidorübersetzung vor, mit der das Monseer Stück *De Vocatione Gentium* sprachlich verwandt ist. Die Umschreibung des Südrheinfränkischen (oder eher Elsässischen, vgl. Nutzhorn, *Zs. f. d. A.* XLIV, 265 ff.) ins Bairische betraf nur das Lautsystem. Dass die Syntax dadurch verändert wurde, lässt sich kaum annehmen.

Wenn Endlicher und Hoffmann *meinit* an der betreffenden Stelle als persönliches Zeitwort (*meinit*, *ait*, 28, 18) auffassten, so zeigt sich darin wieder, dass vieles auf dem Gebiete der Syntax der altgermanischen Sprachen bisher hinter der genauen Untersuchung der Formenlehre hat zurückstehen müssen.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Kansas University.

#### A NOTE ON CYNEWULF'S *CHRIST*

Much controversy has centered around lines 558-585 of Cynewulf's *Christ*. They occur in the middle of the second part, which relates the story of Christ's Ascension. At first glance, it would appear that the passage is out of place and introduces a subject, the Harrowing of Hell, which has no connection with the Ascension.

The poet has described the gathering of the disciples on the mountain, the appearance of the white-robed host, and finally the Ascension itself. In accord with the gospel account, two angels remain behind to explain the scene to the awestruck people. This explanation (lines 517-526) is hardly more than a naïve amplification of *Acts* 1, 11. At line 527 the poet resumes the narrative and describes the return of the disciples to Jerusalem and the entrance of Christ into heaven. This would seem to be all that could be said about the incident of the Ascension, and we might next expect to hear the story of Pentecost.

Instead, however, with line 558 begins, what seems to me, beyond all controversy, a second explanation by the angels of the Ascension scene; this time emphasizing a feature which has been, at most, only hinted at in the two previous descriptions—the ascension with Christ of the patriarchs and prophets whom He had, after His death and before His resurrection, rescued from Limbo. This second speech of the angels is undoubtedly, like the first, directed to the disciples, who are represented as still staring into heaven after their vanishing Lord, in spite of the narrative of lines 527-557. Otherwise there is no meaning in the form of direct address and in the repeated *gē* of lines 570, 573, and 575; while the words *þe gē hēr on stariað* are not only reminiscent of *Acts* 1, 10, 11, but are also a repetition of line 521<sup>b</sup>, where it is perfectly clear that the angel is speaking to the disciples; and to whom more appropriately can lines 575-576<sup>a</sup> refer than to the disciples and to their return to Jerusalem? Moreover, the last part of the passage beginning at line 576<sup>b</sup> must refer to Christ's leading the redeemed into heaven. The angel at this point of his explanation grows dramatic. With a memory of the *Attollite portas* cry of Christ when He harrowed hell (the event he has just described) he exclaims, as he

looks up to the gates of heaven, which Christ and the attendant angels and the redeemed are entering,

.....	geatu, ontȳnað;
wile in tō ēow	ealles Wāldend,
Cyning on ceastre . . . . .	
.....	folc gelædan

*in tō ēow* and *on ceastre* can hardly be construed to mean anything other than the gates of the heavenly city and that city itself. The Earthly Paradise, whither the patriarchs and prophets were taken after the Harrowing of Hell, would hardly be spoken of in such terms.

But this does not dismiss the difficulties the editors have found in the passage. If lines 517-526 and lines 558-585 are both speeches of the angels, addressed to the disciples who are gazing after the ascending Christ, why are the passages separated by the narrative of events clearly subsequent to both? Professor Cook, in his notes, calls attention to other chronological lapses in this class of medieval compositions. To those familiar with the Greek and Latin homilists, of which this part of the *Christ* is reminiscent, the repetition and the ignoring of the exact order of events offer no difficulty.

But seemingly a discriminating artistic purpose prompted this transposition. After the Ascension scene had been pictured twice, there still remained one thing too important to be treated as a mere feature of a general description; for the Ascension of those rescued from hell was prophetic of the final ascension at the Last Judgment of all who believe in Christ. Yet if a third description followed directly on the other two, even the dramatic intensity and the new point of view could not save the poet from repetitious monotony. As it stands here, however, set off from the others by the story of the return to Jerusalem, while its intent and relationship is clear enough, its transposition brings in the element of surprise which enhances the value of the new point of view and makes this speech of the angels a distinct addition to the picture of the episode. The clue to the reason for this third description lies in the lines

Cyning on ceastre, . . . . .
..... folc gelædan
..... þe hē on dēoflum genōm.

This passage (lines 558-585) opens with a vigorous description of Christ's Harrowing of Hell, and the question has repeatedly been raised as to why these angels of the Ascension should go back and tell the story of the overthrow of Satan and the rescue of the souls from Limbo. The interpretation has been that, because the patriarchs and prophets ascended with Christ, their presence had to be explained to the disciples, who, of course, knew nothing of all that had previously taken place in Hell. The Ascension scene from the *Frankfurter Dirigierrolle*,<sup>1</sup> which I describe below, makes it absolutely plain to me that this is the connection between these two incidents. When I brought this part of the German Passion-play to the attention of Professor F. G. Hubbard, he agreed that nothing which has been hitherto brought forward as evidence so adequately and finally clears up the questions that have arisen with regard to these lines.

This *Frankfurter Dirigierrolle* is the manuscript of the stage directions and the *incipits* of the speeches (in Latin and in German vernacular) of a fourteenth-century Passion-play. After an introductory scene between S. Augustine, the prophets of Christ, and a group of Jews who question Christ's Messiahship, the play goes on to portray the life of Christ from the beginning of His ministry to His Ascension. In due course, immediately after the Crucifixion, the *Harrowing* is given in detail. Those rescued then are delivered over by Christ to the Archangel Michael to be conducted to the Earthly Paradise. Thus was the audience which witnessed the Passion-play already prepared when, in pantomime, Christ goes to Paradise, summons the patriarchs, and leads them to the place from which he is to ascend. The *Christ* lacks this feature and therefore requires that all explanations be made in the scene itself; and the persons to do this are naturally the angels who alone are cognizant of all the facts. As we compare the two texts it is to be noticed that the play directs that the redeemed must be *indutis vestibis albis*, while lines 447 and 454 of the *Christ* lay special stress on the *hwitum hræglum* of the attendant host.

The scene of the *Dirigierrolle* embraces the dialog-parts numbered 347-358 by Froning (pp. 371 f.).

ADELINE M. JENNEY.

University of Wisconsin.

<sup>1</sup> R. Froning, *Das Drama des Mittelalters, Zweiter Teil*, pp. 371-373.

## DOPPELDRUCKE VON GOETHES TASSO, 1816

Im Apparate der Weimarer Ausgabe, Bd. 10, S. 425, bemerkt Karl Weinhold, dass in einem Teil dieser mit E<sup>2</sup> bezeichneten Auflage das Personenverzeichniss mit kleineren und dünneren Lettern gedruckt sei: dass hier trotz des gleichlautenden Titels ein ganz anderer Druck vorliegen könne, scheint ihm nicht eingefallen zu sein. Friedrich Meyer weist dann unter No. 1110 f. seiner *Goethe-Bibliothek* auf zwei verschiedene Drucke dieses Jahres hin, ohne jedoch genaue Kennzeichen anzugeben. Tatsächlich existieren nun nicht weniger als vier Drucke (E<sup>2a</sup>, E<sup>2b</sup>, E<sup>2c</sup>, E<sup>2d</sup>) dieses Datums, die jedoch zweifellos nicht sämtlich im Jahre 1816 erschienen sind. Wozu sollte denn der Verleger den Text, den er seit 25 Jahren nicht neu aufgelegt hatte, jetzt plötzlich viermal hinter einander setzen lassen, wo einmaliger Satz genügte? Es liegt auf der Hand, dass mehrere dieser Drucke späteren Ursprungs sein müssen, obschon das Datum jedesmal 1816 ist. Der Verleger hatte augenscheinlich seine guten Gründe dafür, bei jedem Neudrucke das ursprüngliche Datum beizubehalten. Auch sonst stimmen die vier Drucke äusserlich überein, nur der jüngste Druck E<sup>2d</sup> hat auf dem Titelblatt acht (anstatt sieben) Zeilen, indem die Worte *Ein Schauspiel* je eine Zeile einnehmen. Dazu ist die für diesen Druck gebrauchte Textschrift grösser als bei den früheren Drucken. In den Drucken E<sup>2ab</sup> findet sich ferner die Bogenbezeichnung nur auf der Schöndruckseite, in E<sup>2cd</sup> dazu auf der Widerdruckseite.

Textkritischen Wert hat zwar keiner dieser Drucke, die sämtlich den alten Text des Jahres 1790 wiedergeben, mit dem sie sogar seitengleich (222 S.) übereinstimmen: da sie jedoch als rechtmässige Ausgaben einen Platz in der Goethe-Literatur beanspruchen, dürfte es zweckmässig sein, hier die Unterscheidungsmerkmale anzugeben, die eventuell zur Entdeckung von noch weiteren Drucken führen möchten:

S. 2, 3 Schwester des Herzogs E<sup>2a</sup>, des Herzogs Schwester E<sup>2bcd</sup>. 4, 1 **Leonore**] fehlt E<sup>2c</sup>. 4, 21 Ariostens E<sup>2a</sup>, Ariosts E<sup>2bcd</sup>. 13, 11 fern; E<sup>2a</sup>, fern: E<sup>2bcd</sup>. 14, 10 schleicht E<sup>2a</sup>, steigt E<sup>2bcd</sup>. 15, 17 Spähren E<sup>2a</sup>, Sphären E<sup>2bcd</sup>. 16, 13 Kind: E<sup>2ab</sup>, Kind; E<sup>2d</sup>, *Interpunktion* fehlt E<sup>2c</sup>. 19, 10 vor Schritt E<sup>2abc</sup>, für Schritt E<sup>2d</sup>.



23, 1 thue was ich kann E<sup>2ab</sup>, thue was ich kann, E<sup>2c</sup>, thue, was ich kann, E<sup>2d</sup>. 25, 11 f. Prinzessin nach E<sup>2ab</sup>, Prinzessin. nach E<sup>2c</sup>, Prinzessin. Nach E<sup>2d</sup>. 27, 21 innren E<sup>2a</sup>, innern E<sup>2bcd</sup>. 28,9 Noth. E<sup>2ab</sup>, Noth, E<sup>2cd</sup>. 29, 10 Krieges—E<sup>2ab</sup>, Kriegs—E<sup>2c</sup>, Kriegs,—E<sup>2d</sup>. 30, 7 ich wenn E<sup>2ab</sup>, ich, wenn E<sup>2cd</sup>. 32, 16 theuren E<sup>2abc</sup>, theuern E<sup>2d</sup>. 107, 8 Möcht' ich E<sup>2abd</sup>, Möcht ich E<sup>2c</sup>. 109, 3 verlernen E<sup>2a</sup>, verkennen E<sup>2bcd</sup>. 110, 1 zum empfehlen E<sup>2ab</sup> (*Druckfehler*), zu empfehlen E<sup>2cd</sup>. 110, 18 nicht Einen E<sup>2ab</sup>, nicht einen E<sup>2cd</sup>. 206, 2 einem leichten Wedel E<sup>2abc</sup>, einer leichten Wedel E<sup>2d</sup>.

W. KURRELMAYER.

---

 REVIEWS

*Las Paredes Oyen*, por JUAN RUIZ DE ALARCÓN, edited with introduction and notes by CAROLINE BOURLAND. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1914. 12mo., xxx + 189 pp.

Thanks are due the courageous editor for making available another classic text for students who desire to pursue at first hand, studies in the Spanish drama of the seventeenth century. While the introduction is well done and comprehensive, the bibliography remarkably complete and the work very free from typographical imperfections, the edition still leaves much to be desired in the way of offering a text which is really intelligible from beginning to end, to either the beginner or the advanced student. In many cases the difficulties have not been pointed out; in still others the interpretations offered are open to objection. Withal, the text is useful, and the remarks that follow are offered as an addition to its usefulness.

The editor is to be congratulated on her courage in returning to the correct readings of the *princeps* in so many cases. In this, however, she should have gone still further; e. g., I, 327, *anhela* of the princeps is correct (see below); II, 474, *defensa un criado* should have been kept as it stood or as *defensa (a) un criado*, as the omission of the *a* was not an error but a fairly regular method of rendering actual pronunciation. The same phenomenon has been overlooked in I, 210, *importa una vida*, which means 'it

concerns a life,' not 'a life is at stake.' A similar principle is to be observed in III, 78, which has also escaped annotation or correction: *¿Quién dirá señora, que es*, etc. is . . . *dirá(s), señora* (Celia does not address her mistress in the third person); III, 354, *tampoco* was a regular and correct spelling even in the meaning of the passage and might well have been kept with its interpretation given in the notes; III, 310, *aborrecen* was regular and correct, and the *sic* of the note is unnecessary.

Of the introduction little need be said; if anything might well be added it would be the placing of Alarcón in his relation to his predecessors and contemporaries. Perhaps the justice of the statement on p. xvii, that the last syllable of the *verso agudo* has the same value in time as the two last syllables of the *verso llano* might be questioned. The ease, simplicity and directness of Alarcón's style (pp. iv and xvi) have probably been overestimated here as elsewhere, and the "few puzzling lines" and the "slight touches of gongorism" will multiply on close examination.

While typographical errors are practically absent, the errors and inconsistencies of punctuation and accentuation form one of the weakest points of the text. Some of the most serious are the following: *vidrieras*, I, 952; *confianza*, I, 612; *fiel*, I, 842; *variar*, II, 142; all need the trema to provide the necessary number of syllables for the correct line, a principle recognized by the editor in *presuntuoso*, II, 32.

I, 71. *¿Quanto mejor*, etc., is not a question and should stand:

¿Cuánto mejor era Febo!

Y Dafne lo desdénó:

I, 238. *Górgona* should be written with a capital as in Ochoa and Hartzenbusch. So also *Momo*, I, 885, as in Hartzenbusch and Ochoa—the failure to capitalize rests on a misinterpretation of the text.

I, 720-21. The comma after *previene* separates *mujer* from its verb; either remove it or place a corresponding one in v. 720, before *en*.

I, 773 ff. *tuviera* has for its conclusion *haga* of v. 775; to separate them by suspension and colon makes the passage unintelligible. The meaning is 'And let the niggard who objects to giving—women are always begging—make it his custom to refuse.'

I, 915. *Divierte* is the conclusion of *impide* (907) and *quieres* (910), and the sense of the passage is only obscured by the semicolon which closes v. 913.

I, 925-29. The question closes with *mi* of v. 927.

II, 161. *De la encontrada porfia* depends on *nació* of v. 166 and the semicolon of 164 renders the text unintelligible. The meaning is: 'from the argument, in which Mendo opposed a thousand defects to the graces of Doña Ana which I enumerated, there sprang up etc.'

II, 739-40. *de cera, de bronce* are both predicates of *ser* (737) and are hardly intelligible standing as they do in immediate juxtaposition to *acusación* and *descargo* respectively without separating commas. A comma after *ser* would also be of aid. The meaning is: 'Is it possible that the one who has shown me the greatest favors is so impressionable to the accusation against me, so obdurate to my defense?'

II, 782-83. *Que ha menester* depends on *informes*, and the passage is meaningless as it stands, with semicolon separating the two members mentioned.

III, 97-100 makes the duke say that he must be going in order that Ana may sleep, which spoils the compliment and is not the meaning of the speaker. The meaning is that the sun is now coming out to resume its functions in order that Ana, who has been the sun in the meantime, may go to rest. Ochoa has the correct punctuation.

III, 666. On the misunderstanding of the sentence occasioned by the semicolon see below on III, 667.

In the matter of accentuation it is difficult to see what system the editor has followed. *Ti*, generally without the accent, occurs with it at I, 569, *a tí te dan*. The pronoun *él*, capitalized, bears the accent at III, 161; III, 661; I, 1030; III, 74; III, 957; III, 176; but omits it at I, 676; II, 173. *Oir*, I, 571; III, 773; III, 661, should bear the accent.

The substantive demonstratives appear with accent at I, 768; III, 601; III, 305; but omit it at III, 451; I, 667; I, 744; I, 792, and elsewhere with initial capital, although as seen above capitalization has not always replaced written accent.

An equal inconsistency in the accentuation of verb forms is in evidence, e. g., *detente*, III, 326 and II, 804; but III, 108, *Detén*

and III, 112, *Entretén*. (It may not be urged in defense that in one case the verb-forms in question support enclitics—Ramsay, *Text Book of Modern Spanish*, 29—as shown by the edition under discussion at III, 335, *Vete en buen hora*, a principle overlooked, however, again at I, 516, *vete segura*). *Pára* verb, both indicative and imperative, stands with the diacritic accent to differentiate it from the preposition, while *prueba*, verb, is used without it although there would be the same need to separate it from the noun.

The *que* for *qué* in III, 284, gives a wrong interpretation of text. The introduction to the Hartzenbusch edition, p. xxxiii, shows the correct accentuation. The meaning is, 'For this may be practiced by one who has nothing to lose or has nothing that can be thrown back at him.' In other words, people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. On the syntactical impossibility of the rendering in the note see below, on I, 740-741, and III, 283-284.

*Sino*, I, 3, should be written as two words as in III, 142; it is not the *sino*, 'but, except.' *Quien*, I, 934 is incorrectly used without accent; so, also, *Sinon*, I, 843.

*Mas ¡ qué*, etc., I, 930, owes its accentuation and punctuation to erroneous interpretation of the text. It means 'More likely it would be that fate had ordered, etc.' or something similar. The phrase '*mas que*' is a stock introduction to an objection or contradiction and is correctly interpreted at II, 721 and 722. This phrase occurs too frequently in seventeenth-century drama dialogue to require documentation; I mention, in passing, another example which was misunderstood by its editor—*Moza de Cántaro* (ed. Stathers), v. 1086—"¿*Mas qué os ha de causar risa?*"—"But what are you going to laugh at?" instead of the correct 'I am sure you will laugh at me!'

The notes are very useful in spite of leaving so much to be desired. Their use would have been greatly facilitated had the edition numbered its verses consecutively from beginning to end, or else headed each page of the notes with the act to which they belong. Furthermore, the writer believes that notes covering material accessible in the commonest books of reference should be reduced to the smallest possible compass or omitted altogether. To such belong the annotations on Daphne, Acates, Sinon, Quinto Fabio, Marcial Vulcano, and others similar, which might almost be dismissed with the equivalent form of English usage. Of a

different kind and well deserving of annotation are the Hípia, Tetis, Faustina, Egira, Jupiter (I, 234) and others. With the failure to annotate the difficulties and allusions, which will be mentioned below, it is doubtful whether so much time and space should have been taken up with *Mendoza*, I, 37; *novena*, I, 157; *San Juan*, I, 159; *Toros*, II, 114-20, and others—all worthy, however, of annotation. It is not clear why *satisfacciones*, II, 579, should have been singled out for annotation when *difinición*, II, 168; *lición*, II, 230; and *mesmas*, III, 500, are passed by.

Notwithstanding the value of the annotations on the text it is not unlikely that the following supplementary remarks will add to their usefulness:

I, 3-4. *partes* are not necessarily either 'talents' or 'natural gifts,' as will be seen from the following: "Dime las partes . . . desa casa," Alarcón, *Bib.*, vol. LII, 182a; "Solo valen . . . Proprias y adquiridas partes," *ibid.*, 470b; cf. *Prueba de las Promesas*, I, ii, . . . "partes de rico, noble y galán."

I, 23. *Faustina*. The note does not explain the allusion, which, by the way, is not correct. The author has mixed his references: Híppia is the one who loved the ugly swordsman; Faustina, the one who "cumplió Mil injustos deseos . . ." according to Capitolinus, ch. xix.

I, 27. *Hípia*. The note is true enough but not to the point. Juvenal does not charge Híppia with the iniquities brought against her by our author. The explanation is to be found in the note here above.

I, 51. *Egira*. The note is an excellent one but fails to call attention to a necessary interpretation, viz., the use of *un* (templo) which furnishes the whole point to the comparison—'in one and the same temple . . .'. Cf. also I, 421—not 'Post-haste in a coach . . .' but by post 'in one and the same coach' instead of in two coaches which they used in making the pilgrimage to Alcalá (I, 553) and in returning (II, 101).

I, 77. *murmurar* is regularly used as in this play, and the note might well have been omitted.

I, 81. *Decir* . . . If this *decir* is a reiteration or resumption of v. 78, points of suspension should have been used to indicate the connection at the end of v. 78. As it stands—and quite properly—it marks the beginning of a new defense of Beltrán:

"Decir la verdad no es murmurar, no se debe culpar" or similar words.

I, 89-90. *Veste . . . voces* has nothing to do with *predicar en desierto* nor with the English 'talk to deaf ears' both of which mean to 'preach in vain'; 'none so deaf as those who won't hear'; its meaning can be exactly understood from the use of the same expression in *Don Quixote*, II, ch. LV (*Lectura* edition, vol. VIII, p. 11), viz., 'You see that your condition is hopeless and still you call for help; not, 'you are trying to convince someone who will not listen.' The connotation is further given in vv. 91-92.

I, 102. *el mismo no esperar*. If the note be needed at all it should be differently stated. The use of the negative in no wise affects the use of an infinitive as a substantive.

I, 131. *arresgarme*: the note should have added that the undiphthongized *e* of the stem occurs only when not under the accent.

I, 157. *novena* (also *novenas*). Although Doña Ana was going to ask San Diego to prosper her intended marriage, the purpose of the *novena* was to fulfill a vow, as is plainly shown in I, 505, or at least the fulfillment of the *novena* was a thing apart from the prayers for the prosperity of her approaching marriage. It is more likely that the specific purpose of the *Novena* was the fulfillment of some vow made in sickness, as in Lope, *Al Pasar del Arroyo*, I, iv. Cf. also Tirso, *En Madrid y en una Casa*, III, iii; Alarcón, *Todo es ventura*, III, vi.

I, 175. The note, while entirely correct, does not give the reader the necessary connotation, viz., 'Well, what I see, (I can believe, can't I?)' or, 'You needn't tell me, I can see for myself.'

I, 181. *Agora*, although obsolescent, was not confined to verse in the seventeenth century.

I, 233. The passage is not corrupt, although the classical knowledge of the author is as we have found it before. The character referred to is Hippolytus of Vergil's *Aeneid*, VII, 761-782. It was Aesculapius, however, who had brought him to life—not Jupiter, who, on the contrary, struck him dead again with the thunderbolt.

I, 274. *a vos*. Not too much should be inferred from the Spanish drama as to the use of pronominal form of address. In fact *vos* continues in verse drama long after *usted* had become the only form of polite address in use. Much better evidence is furnished by the prose of *Lazarillo* and *Don Quixote*. The latter (II, ch. 32),



shows that in the third person was the courteous address and the former (Tratado III), very explicitly states that the *vos* was rather the minimum of courtesy among equals of rank than the regular *courteous* address: "a los mas altos como yo no les han de hablar menos de: beso las manos de vuestra merced, o, por lo menos, bésoos, señor, las manos, si el que me habla es caballero." (Alarcón's *Prueba de las Promesas, Biblioteca*, vol. 52, p. 438 b, shows that the third person was used in formal and ceremonious address—; Ya me habláis de impersonal?) *Vos*, then, was still used in the seventeenth century, but it was a familiar form and not a courteous address—although not, of course, discourteous among equals of rank. Except as above stated, in fact, it carried a decided modicum of courtesy as may be seen below, II, 801, where Mendo addresses the supposed coachman, "Dios os guarde."

I, 324. *Vencedor . . . vencido*. Don Juan's idea is not that the exalted object of his love makes him a victor but that his only victory lies in being convinced that he has nothing to hope for—'Victorious only in being conquered.' *En lo que* here does not stand for *en lo en que* but for *en que*. This construction although not exceedingly common is well attested, and the examples below suffice to demonstrate its existence:

. . . estoy temiendo agora,  
Por lo que te veo huyr,  
Que te pesa de fingir.  
(Lope, *Burlas Veras*, v. 1006 ff., Rosenberg ed.)

'I am beginning to fear, *since* [not for *por lo por que*] I see you retreating, that you are getting tired of pretending.'

. . . contra mí se irritan,  
De lo que os quiero, envidiosos.  
(Alarcón, *Crueldad por el Honor*, III, 1.)

'on account of my loving you, etc.'

The usage is more familiar to us in the French construction—*en ce que*, *à ce que*, *de ce que*, etc., of which, of course, the regular *parce que* is only the most familiar example.

I, 325-327. *Así . . . sigo*.—*su muerte sigo* cannot mean 'follow them in death,' nor is there any reason to consider the *anhela* of the *princeps* an error, its subject being *deseo*. The real meaning of the sonnet is that there is nothing to hope for and accordingly the nearest approach to felicity permitted to the lover would be to

free himself entirely of his desire. On account of the difficulty of the entire sonnet its full translation may not be out of place:

I flee the truth; of hope I demand illusion to nourish my affection; eternal obstacles I perceive against me; I am swimming in the depths with nothing to hold to.

With my boldest flight of love I cannot rise, and at last, in spite of all my efforts, I am overcome by what I needs must believe, becoming, thus, victorious only in being thus overcome (convinced).

So, victorious in my despair, I refuse to delude my love, and more living does it aspire to felicity if I strive for its annihilation.

Sad, indeed, where despair is inevitable; where the only victory is in ceasing to hope, where victory makes greater the power of the enemy.

The last tercet should have safeguarded the editor from the interpretations offered in the two notes in question.

Equally 'fine spun' is the discourse of Don Mendo in I, XII—which again the editor has not entirely understood.

I, 396. *coche de camino*, not as rendered but 'drive me toward the Alcalá gate.' Leonardo has just announced that the coach is ready and Don Mendo is giving orders for the drive, not ordering a 'traveling coach' to be held in readiness at the Alcalá gate. For examples of this predicate use of *de camino*, if indeed any are necessary, cf. I, 173, and Alarcón, *Favores del Mundo*, II, xv, ¿De camino venis?—not 'Are you just in from a trip?' but 'Do you come prepared for a trip?' The meaning of the text is still better seen from Alarcón, *Todo es Ventura*, I, xvi,

Pónganme el coche al momento  
De camino.

I, 398. *Parta . . . repostero*. Although the Spanish inn has been in discredit and rightly so since the days of Gaguin (Morel-Fatio, *Etudes sur l'Espagne*, 2nd edition, I, p. 19-20), to say that the traveler 'was obliged' to send out for his raw material is going altogether too far. The literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century fairly teems with evidence to the contrary: *Don Quixote*, I, ch. 2, informs us that *on account of its being Friday* there was nothing to eat at the inn but *abadejo*; *ibid.*, I, ch. 32, "Hizo el cura que les aderezaron de comer de lo que en la venta hubiese y el huesped . . . les aderezó una razonable comida"; *ibid.*, II, ch. 59 tells us that 'birds of the air, fowls of the earth, or fish of the

sea' were on hand. The fact that this claim of the inn-keeper was somewhat exaggerated does not change the principle. See further Lope, *Moza de Cántaro*, I, xiii; Luna, *Lazarillo de Tormes*, 2nd part, ch. 12; Alarcón, *Tejedor de Segovia*, III, i, and, lastly, though the Venta de Viveros was notoriously bad (Tirso, *Por el Sótano*, I, ii, "En Venta de Viveros; Piden camas o Pulgas"?) we learn from Quevedo, *Buscón*, ch. iv, that something to eat was obtainable,—“dème lo que hubiere para mí y para dos criados.” A better class of inn is mentioned in Tirso, *Desde Madrid a Toledo*, II, i: . . . “Olias, Están sus ventas llenas De Parominos, vaca y berengenas.”

I, 401. *venta de Vivero*. There is no doubt about the form—it should be *Viveros* except for the exigencies of the rhyme. This inn was a regular institution in the seventeenth century and is often mentioned. Some idea of its nature can be obtained from the passage of the *Buscón* mentioned above. According to Guzmán de Alfarache, II, 7, it was an afternoon's ride from Alcalá and was the regular stopping place on all trips between Alcalá and Madrid. See Lope, *Al Pasar del Arroyo*, I, v.

I, 421. *por la posta*, not 'post-haste' but 'by post [together] in one carriage'; for the use of *un coche* see above on I, 51.

I, 468. *Por quien . . . Henares*. *Manzanares* is not absolute but subject of *hace*; *España* is not subject of *hace* but its factitive object; *de sus glorias* is not partitive factitive object of *hace* but depends on *España*. The meaning is 'This bewheeled ship is making, as it were, a voyage from Manzanares to Alcalá just as a galleon would from the Indies to Spain.' More literally: 'through whom, the Manzanares, becoming the Indies (point of departure) makes out of the Henares the Spain of its desires (destination.)' In other words, the coach is making Alcalá the goal of its felicity just as Spain would be for the ship.

I, 470. *primero móvil*. The form here is used for exigencies of the rhyme although the seventeenth century occasionally used it in prose. The regular form, however, even in Alarcón is *primer móvil* or *móvil primero*, e. g. *Industria y la Suerte*, II, vii; *Prueba de las Promesas*, II, I.

I, 507. *opinión . . . opiniones*. The first interpretation is correct, not so the second. *En opiniones*, also occasionally *en opinión* (e. g., *Industria y la Suerte*, I, XIV) is a phrase of which Alarcón is very fond; it means 'in doubt,' 'debatable.'

I, 555. *Por puntos*. Although 'frequently' makes a good English rendering for the passage under treatment it is by no means the real meaning of the expression, which is 'continually,' 'all the time.' That is, 'I shall write you all the time I stay there.' If one or two examples may be permitted to show the real meaning:

. . . quien tiene en Argel el cuerpo preso  
Tendrá por puntos en su tierra el alma

(Lope, *Ausente en el Lugar*.)

*Por momentos* is used in the same sense, e. g., Lope, *Acero de Madrid*, II, VII.

[These notes will be continued.]

F. O. REED.

University of Wisconsin.

*Les Méditations poétiques*, par Alphonse de Lamartine. Nouvelle édition, publiée d'après les manuscrits et les éditions originales, par Gustave Lanson. Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1915. 2 vols. clxxx + 1-270 and 271-600 pp.

*Les Méditations Poétiques*, lorsqu'elles parurent en mars 1820, formaient un mince recueil de vingt-quatre pièces, que des apports successifs ont grossi. M. Lanson a pris pour base le texte de cette première édition; il a classé séparément, selon leur date de publication, les pièces nouvelles de 1820, 1823, et 1849, les préfaces et les commentaires de 1849. Les notes critiques contiennent, avec un certain nombre de variantes, les esquisses et premières rédactions fournies par la correspondance et les manuscrits du poète. La notice et les notes qui accompagnent chaque pièce forment un riche commentaire, à la fois psychologique, littéraire et historique. L'introduction n'est pas moins substantielle: on y trouvera des indications, précises et documentées, sur l'éducation et les lectures de Lamartine; une histoire de sa vie intérieure pendant les années où il composa les *Méditations*; enfin une étude sur la destinée et l'influence de son livre. M. Lanson a résumé les jugements de la critique depuis 1820 jusqu'à 1913; il relève, avec les impressions de quelques lecteurs notables, les imitations que l'œuvre nouvelle suscita, jusqu'en 1830, tant en province qu'à Paris. La bibliographie énumère, avec les éditions et manuscrits, les illustrations qui ont orné le texte de Lamartine, les compositions musicales

dont il a fourni le sujet, les traductions, enfin, qui répandirent bientôt à l'étranger la jeune gloire du poète.<sup>1</sup>

C'est, on le voit, un imposant ouvrage que M. Lanson donne au public. Le but qu'il s'est proposé n'est pas seulement d'éclaircir le sens littéral du texte. Grâce aux matériaux qu'il a réunis, M. Lanson reconstitue les conditions où l'œuvre de Lamartine s'est formée. Il la rétablit dans ses rapports avec la vie et l'éducation du poète, avec le goût littéraire et la sensibilité du temps. Rattacher les œuvres aux conditions extérieures dont elles dépendent, c'est ce que prétendait faire Taine. Mais Taine, concevant ce rapport d'une façon trop rigide, semblait ne pas tenir compte de ce qu'il y a de libre et d'individuel dans le génie. Du reste, tandis qu'il attribuait à certains facteurs,—race, milieu, moment,—le pouvoir de déterminer l'œuvre, il les caractérisait d'une façon trop générale, et ne faisait nullement saisir les circonstances et les modes de leur action. La méthode critique est à la fois moins absolue dans sa conception des dépendances et plus rigoureuse dans leur recherche. Elle ne pose point le problème en termes de mécanique, mais en termes d'histoire. Aux combinaisons de formules, plus ou moins arbitraires, elle substitue l'étude concrète et minutieuse des faits. En analysant sans parti pris le jeu des influences multiples et complexes, elle ne supprime ni n'oublie l'originalité de l'écrivain : bien au contraire, elle la précise et l'éclaire plus vivement. Si les œuvres, d'ailleurs, sont des "effets," elles peuvent à leur tour devenir "causes." M. Lanson, grâce à ses recherches, permet d'apprécier l'ébranlement communiqué par l'ouvrage de Lamartine au public contemporain et à la postérité. L'œuvre se trouve ainsi réellement, et en un double sens, replacée dans son milieu.

On conçoit l'intérêt qu'offre un pareil travail, exécuté par M. Lanson. Son édition apporte beaucoup d'idées et suggestions neuves ; elle nuance ou fortifie des idées déjà émises ; elle crée la possibilité d'études nouvelles sur Lamartine. Nous nous contenterons d'indiquer ici quelques points, sur lesquels les recherches de M. Lanson font la lumière.

Grâce à son histoire si nuancée des idées et des sentiments de Lamartine, M. Lanson dégage, d'une façon saisissante, le rapport de l'œuvre à la personnalité de l'auteur. A travers les *Méditations*,

<sup>1</sup> De 1822 à 1832, Lamartine est traduit en allemand, anglais, polonais, portugais, et suédois. M. Lanson ne cite pas de traduction russe, mais les *Méditations*, que le public instruit pouvait lire dans le texte, eurent une grande vogue en Russie.

on entrevoit un poète idéaliste, tout absorbé dans sa rêverie, dans son amour, dans le souvenir de l'unique amante perdue. Le vrai Lamartine n'est point si uniforme: il avait d'autres préoccupations que l'amour, d'autres amours que celui de Mme Charles. Il pensait à la vie pratique, à s'établir, à se marier. Il ne dédaignait point d'être actif et avisé. Mais son œuvre n'est pas l'expression directe de tous ses états d'âme; il entend en exclure ceux qui ne lui semblent pas poétiques: la gaieté, la volonté, l'espoir robuste dans l'avenir. Il a d'ailleurs trop de goût pour confier à ses lecteurs les soucis de carrière et d'argent qui le tourmentent. Sa poésie n'est point le journal de ses affaires et de ses émotions; il n'y faut point chercher de biographie, ni même de roman, mais l'expression sincère et géniale de quelques sentiments, à la fois très modernes et profondément humains. De là vient l'intérêt éternel de cette poésie; par ce qu'elle exclut de réalité individuelle, l'œuvre gagne en vérité générale et humaine.

Si les *Méditations* restaient classiques par cette "généralisation" des sentiments, on peut dire qu'elles le restaient aussi par la forme. Des rapprochements que M. Lanson a multipliés au bas des pages il résulte que l'écrivain, chez Lamartine, se rattache à la tradition des siècles précédents. Sa langue poétique reste celle de Racine et de Voltaire, celle surtout des élégiaques du premier Empire. Il répète leurs comparaisons, leurs rapprochements, leurs épithètes, et, il faut le dire, leurs clichés. Un goût plus nouveau peut-être se marque dans les emprunts qu'il fait à Chateaubriand, à Mme de Staël et aux Ecritures-Saintes. Mais, habilement fondus dans l'ensemble, ces emprunts n'en altèrent point le caractère classique. Son vers, aussi, se soumet aux exigences traditionnelles. Quelle différence pourtant, de Lamartine à un Baour-Lourmian, à un Fontanes, à un Millevoye! Les expressions, chez eux banales, sont ici mises en valeur par un sentiment délicat du style; mais surtout, un souffle puissant ranime ces formes usées, et le vers rend un son nouveau. L'originalité de Lamartine ne se résout point en inventions précises, en tours, en procédés de style; elle est, dirions-nous, intérieure. Lamartine ne renouvelle point la langue, mais il ressuscite la poésie par l'émotion et la musique. Moins écrivain que tel autre romantique, il est plus essentiellement, plus purement poète.

Les *Méditations poétiques* ne posaient donc point leur auteur en révolutionnaire. Dans les débuts, d'ailleurs si timides et



indécis, du mouvement romantique, leur succès put n'être pas considéré comme une victoire de la nouveauté littéraire. En 1824 encore, Lamartine n'accepte pas sans restriction le titre de romantique. C'est souvent à travers bien des incertitudes que les écrivains prennent conscience de leurs affinités, tandis qu'après coup et à distance nous pouvons les percevoir nettement. Quoi qu'il en soit, le succès des *Méditations* fut extraordinaire, et le public, plus sûrement que les hommes de lettres, sentit qu'une poésie nouvelle était née. La fortune littéraire de Lamartine traversa des phases diverses; elle s'affermir encore après 1830; mais, dans la seconde moitié du siècle, la domination de l'esthétique parnassienne devait lui être fatale. Par les fantaisistes indiscretions des *Commentaires* et des *Confidences*, qui prêtaient à sa poésie un sens biographique, Lamartine s'était offert lui-même aux sévérités des théoriciens de l'art objectif. Son discrédit, pendant une trentaine d'années, sembla profond; mais, vers 1890, la réaction symboliste lui ramena la faveur de la jeunesse littéraire. Le grand public ne paraît pas avoir suivi les fluctuations de la critique, et, quand de jeunes écrivains affirmaient qu'on ne lisait plus Lamartine, la librairie pouvait leur répondre qu'on l'achetait du moins toujours.

Mais c'est dans l'introduction et le commentaire de M. Lanson, dans ces pages si fortes et si lumineuses, qu'il faut chercher ces idées avec bien d'autres. M. Lanson nous a donné le pendant de son admirable édition des *Lettres philosophiques*. Sa nouvelle œuvre, modèle d'une critique pénétrante et d'une inflexible rigueur scientifique, apprend beaucoup et fait beaucoup penser. Elle est indispensable à qui veut connaître d'un peu près Lamartine. Et les lecteurs dilettanti, soucieux seulement de jouir des beaux vers, trouveront qu'à la consulter, la jouissance esthétique devient plus pleine et plus délicate.

E. CARCASSONNE.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*The Court and the London Theatres during the Reign of Elizabeth.*

By THORNTON SHIRLEY GRAVES. Dissertation. University of Chicago, 1913.

Professor Graves enters a field where it is increasingly difficult to produce any original results. So many have gone through the extant records of the period with such minuteness that students are becoming skeptical of finding noteworthy contributions to the sum

of human knowledge concerning the Elizabethan theatre. This impression is deepened when an investigator announces a thesis at variance with the traditional view. Yet that is exactly what Professor Graves does. He finds evidence of court influence "in the general stage structure of the earlier theatres, in certain principles and practices of staging, in various theatrical devices employed for realistic and spectacular effects, and in the general nature of the properties and costumes employed in public performances during the reign of Elizabeth."

What impresses one is the wealth of evidence he has been able to summon. How any one not yet grey-headed should have investigated minutely not only the extant dramas, which indeed lure many a student, but also the contemporary records, such as *The Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, *The Progresses of Elizabeth* and of *James I*, *The Documents of the Revels*, *The Henslow Papers* and *Diary*, *The Calendar of State Papers*, not to mention the *Chronicles* and many more accessible modern books and articles,—how he has done all this fills one with surprise and confidence. The evidence thus assembled he scrutinizes to discover its true meaning and its validity for the issue in hand. The fulness of his knowledge of Elizabethan conditions enables him to determine the bearing of testimony that has heretofore in more than one case been too hastily interpreted.

Professor Graves is alert in challenging statements and exploring the grounds upon which they rest. The greater part of the volume is taken up with attacks on conceptions or conjectures commonly held. Of these refutations the ablest is in the first chapter. He there traverses the position maintained by Neuendorf in *Die englische Volksbühne im Zeitalter Shakespeares*. Neuendorf upholds the plausible theory that there was a development in stage-building during the period 1576-1642, and correspondingly a more or less regular development in the method of staging. He even feels able to describe the main types of stage. Now this theory, as Professor Graves points out, rests on the assumption that the *vorhanglose Bühne* was a common institution in sixteenth-century England. Professor Graves sifts the evidence. He shows that curtains were used in court and public performances as early as the reign of Henry VIII. He explains the stage directions in some plays cited by Neuendorf so as to throw grave doubt on their value

as evidence for a curtainless stage. He introduces various passages referring to curtains. He discusses with equal acumen the Swan sketch, maintaining incidentally the conjecture that the "heavens" extended all over the stage, and concluding that DeWitt's drawing cannot be used to prove the prevalence of the *vorhanglose Bühne* before 1603. It is a conclusion which his candid, thorough testing of the evidence brings the student to adopt.

The inn-yard theory of the origin of the Elizabethan stage he attacks with the same demand for proof on every point. He has collected an interesting group of passages recording performances in town halls and the great rooms of nobles. On the other hand, he examines with illuminating care the passages hitherto relied on to establish the time-honored theory. In another chapter he has some diverting remarks on the alternation theory, and in the end he assails the common notion that the chief characteristic of the Elizabethan theatre was its crudity.

From the nature of the case, Professor Graves has left his own contention concerning court influence in the field of conjecture. He clearly shows its possibility and likelihood. But the direct evidence is too scant to establish more than a presumption. Yet if the monograph does not establish a new theory, it should at least cause readjustment in some common conceptions and a reconsideration of current theories of Elizabethan stages and staging.

DUDLEY H. MILES.

New York City.

---

*The German Lyric*, by Dr. JOHN LEES. London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1914, 8vo., 266 pp.

This book gives in very convenient compass—which by no means reduces it to a mere catalog—a lucid, well-proportioned enumeration of the chief facts of German lyric poetry, dealing sanely with the obvious and the simple, and meeting well the real tho humble demands of those who are not severely exacting. In its diction the work can hardly claim distinction ("songs which caught on"). The author attempts first to clear up the whole field, giving also a faithful caution against British distaste for "sentimentality." The best feature of the book lies in its being based on the good

old method of straight-away intensive study of the subjects at first hand, which has led to honest personal opinions. It is less satisfactory on the side of genetic connections and comparative treatment.

In the main, the estimates show sound appreciation, clearly and simply expressed; to certain details one must take exception: the characterization of Neidhart von Reuenthal misses the essential feature; if *Ein' feste Burg* "follows" the forty-sixth Psalm, it follows, like Peter, afar off; *O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden* ought not to be taken as an original expression of Gerhardt's; particularly unhappy is the statement that the unrimed stanzas of Klopstock "follow" the example of Pyra and Lange: Klopstock's treatment of classic rhythms has no relation whatever to the metrical barbarisms of the *Freundschaftliche Lieder*; Herder can hardly be said to have "inspired" *Lenore*.

The chronic British habit of taking German lyrics seriously, all-too-seriously, asserts itself in the declaration that the *Heidenröslein* is "full of the elements of tragedy," as also in the statement that Goethe's *Kopftisches Lied* is a "didactic poem." A serene gem of purest philistinism is displayed in the judgment which disposes of C. F. Meyer's *Lenzfahrt* as being "another interesting poem, for it tells us of the poet's constant regret for the wasted years of youth." There is no mention of the appearance of Heine's *Lyrisches Intermezzo* in 1823, and the *Neue Gedichte* are spoken of as his "second collection of songs." "The ballad *Azra*" has an unfamiliar ring, and Platen's individuality is insufficiently explained. Annette von Droste-Hülshoff receives somewhat more than her due appreciation, while Geibel's *Juniuslieder* are accounted "only poetical trifles."

This useful work closes with a decidedly optimistic outlook upon the future of German lyric poetry.

J. T. HATFIELD.

*Northwestern University.*

## CORRESPONDENCE

### HERRICK AND *Naps upon Parnassus*

All students of Herrick are impressed by the fact that his *Hesperides*, 1648, did not obtain the success that met Waller's *Poems*, 1645, or Cowley's *Mistress*, 1647. Contrary to the usual custom, Herrick's volume appeared with no commendatory verses. The earliest allusion to the *Hesperides*, a Latin couplet prefixed to *Lucasta*, 1649, actually ranks Lovelace with the author of *Corinna Going A-Maying*. Three lines in the *Musarum Delicia*, 1656, speak of "young Herrick" entertaining the Muses in a sprightly vein with old sack,—hardly an adequate appreciation. It is not until ten years after the *Hesperides* was published that we find as much as six lines devoted to him. To quote from the most recent study of the poet by Floris Delattre,<sup>1</sup> "Dans un simple pamphlet enfin paru en 1658, nous trouvons le plus bel éloge qui ait jamais été fait de Herrick, et qui dut le transporter de joie. On vient de parler des anciens, d'Ovide, de Martial, de Virgile 'qui a tout volé à Homère,' et l'on arrive à Horace :

And then *Placcus Horace*  
He was but a sowr ass,  
And good for nothing but *Lyricks*:  
There's but One to be found  
In all English ground  
Writes as well; who is hight *Robert Herrick*."

In considering this stanza a genuine compliment to the poet, I believe that Delattre and others who have cited it have quite misunderstood its meaning.

It appeared in 1658 in a slender volume printed "by express Order from the Wits, for N. Brook at the Angel in Cornhill," and entitled "*Naps upon Parnassus. A Sleepy Muse nipt and pincht, though not awakened. Such Voluntary and Jovial Copies of Verses, as were lately receiv'd from some of the Wits of the Universities, in a Frolick, dedicated to Gondibert's Mistress by Captain Jones and others. Whereunto is added for the Demonstration of the author's prosaic Excellencys, his Epistle to one of Universities, with the Answer; together with two Satyrical Characters of his Own, of*

<sup>1</sup> *Robert Herrick*, Paris, 1912, p. 110.

*a Temporizer and an Antiquary, with Marginal Notes by a Friend to the Reader."*

As this title sufficiently indicates, the book is pure burlesque. It was written by Thomas Flatman, the poet, Sprat (who became Bishop of Rochester), Woodford, Taylour, Castle, and "other Wits of the University of Oxford" to ridicule Samuel Austin, a Commoner of Wadham College, "vain, conceited, overvaluing his poetic fancy," so Wood informs us. Evidently the victim of this elaborate joke must have been, in the words of the latest historian of Wadham College, "an insufferable coxcomb, a kind of seventeenth century Robert Montgomery." At least it may be said in his favor that he came honestly by his bad verses, for in 1629 his father, Bishop Samuel Austin, published *Urania or the Heavenly Muse, Being a true story of man's fall and redemption, set forth in a poem containing two Bookes: whereof one resembles the Law, the other the Gospel*. This poem of one hundred and thirty-six tedious pages resembles Quarles's work at its lowest depth, the author's unaffected piety being its one saving grace. Plainly the Austin family were not destined for the laurel.

Wishing, then, to overwhelm a conceited poetaster, the Oxford wits obtained some of Austin's verses, added others equally bad, concocted satirical notes and comments and produced *Naps on Parnassus*. This is said to have driven Austin from Oxford to Cambridge. Unfortunately it did not quench his ambition to write, for in 1661 he published *A Panegyrick on his Sacred Majesties Royal Person, Charles the II<sup>d</sup>*.—undoubtedly one of the worst compositions ever inflicted upon English readers:

Your souldiers ride before,  
Not stained with wounds or gore,  
They are arrai'd for sight, and not to fight,  
Their arms made for delight not to affright,  
Bloud displaies only in the paint,  
Great Mars this day looks thin and faint.

If Austin could perpetrate this when a man, what must his verses have been in his college days at Wadham. One is inclined to believe that *Naps on Parnassus* was justified.

This little book, then, was crushingly satirical in its commendatory letters, its comments, its poems. Whenever it praises, it does so in pure irony; for example, its opening verses announce that Austin's poems are far superior to Homer's:



Room, room now for a lusty Poet,  
 That writes as high as any I know yet,  
 What's *Homer* but a *spewing Dog*  
 Who writes a *fight* 'twixt *Mouse and Frog*?  
 Of stout *Achilles* and of *Hector*,  
 Which of them shall be the Victor?

Immediately following this occurs the reference to Herrick. It is always quoted without its context; here are the verses in full:

Then come along Boyes,  
 Valiant and strong Boyes,  
 For here's a *Poet* I tell ye  
 That *Naps on Parnassus*  
 And (O Heaven bless us)  
 Takes *Deep-sleeps* too out of *Heli-*

*Con.* Avaunt then poor *Virgil*,  
 Thou ne'ere dranks't a pure Gill  
 Of Sack, to refine thy sconce:  
 Thou stol'st all from *Homer*,  
 And rod'st on a low *mare*,  
 Instead of *Pegasus* for th'nonce.

Let *Martial* be hang'd,  
 For Ile swear I'll be bang'd,  
 If he makes me ought else but sleepy;  
 He's only at last  
 For a brideling cast,  
 And his *Wit* lies at th' end of his *Epi*

*grams.* Then for *Ovid*,  
 Why? was not his Love hid  
 In's *Book* of *Toyes*, call'd *Amorum*:  
 Indeed there he wrote *madly*,  
 But in's *Tristium* *sadly*;  
 Our *Poet's* th' *Apollo virorum*.

And then *Flaccus Horace*,  
 He was but a sowr-ass,  
 And good for nothing but *Lyricks*:  
 There's but One to be found  
 In all English ground  
 Writes as well; who is hight *Robert Herrick*.

Our *Author's* much better,  
 In every letter  
 Then *Robin*, and *Horace Flaccus*,  
 He is called *Samuel*,  
 Who ends well, and began well;  
 And if we'r not glad He can make us.

Plainly there was no disposition on the part of the author or authors of these lines to bestow "un bel éloge" on anyone. If they praise Austin—or Herrick—it is merely in sport. It is evident that the wits of Oxford knew the Cambridge poet of "brooks, of blossoms, birds and bowers"; it is not evident that they had a high regard for his verse.

EDWARD BLISS REED.

*Yale University.*

---

#### THE JUDGMENT OF PARIS

I wish to draw attention to the fact that some of the more or less responsible makers of Classical Dictionaries are evidently in error in their reports of the offer of Pallas to Paris in the famous judgment between the goddesses. Harper's *Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities* says, "The goddesses appeared before him (i. e. Paris), and each to influence his decision, made him an alluring offer of future advantage, Here by the promise of a Kingdom, Athene by the gift of intellectual superiority<sup>1</sup> and martial renown, and Aphrodite by offering him the fairest woman in the world for his wife." Now, as a matter of fact, reference to Classical literature shows that Athene nowhere makes an offer of wisdom or of intellectual renown. Roscher, in his *Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, basing his statement upon a complete survey of Classical literature, says, "Die Geschichte vom Urteil des Paris bleibt durch die ganze griechisch-römische Litterature in den wesentlichen Zügen gleich, and hat so jedenfalls schon in den 'Kyprien' gestanden." And the offer of Athena in the Cypria is "Victory in every battle."

While the statement of Roscher may be taken as conclusive so far as Greek and Roman literature is concerned, still it is interesting to note that in Middle English literature the prevailing offer of Athena is wisdom and intellectual superiority. In the *Destruction of Troy* (EETS. 39, 56, ed. Panton and Donaldson), ca. 1375, probably the first translation of the Troy story into English, Mercury delivers the promise of Pallas in the following words (ll. 2410 ff.) :

<sup>1</sup> This statement is supported by Sieffert, *Dict. of Classical Antiquities*; Ellis, *1000 Mythological Characters*; *Encyclopedia Britannica*, etc.

And if þou put it to Palades, for your prise lady,  
 Thou shalbe wisest of wit—this wete þou for sothe,  
 And know all the conyng, þat kyndly is for men.

In substantial agreement with this statement are no less than five other M. Eng. versions of about the same time. They may be found in the *Laud Troy Book*, ca. 1400 (ed. Wülfing, EETS. 121, 122), ll. 2469 ff.; Lydgate's *Troy Book*, 1412-20 (ed. Bergen, EETS., Ex. S. 97, 103, 106), Bk. II, l. 2721; Lydgate's *Reson and Sensuallyte* (ed. E. Sieper, EETS., Ex. S. 84, 89), ll. 2004 ff.; Robt. of Brunne's *Chronicle of England*, ca. 1337 (ed. Furnivall, Rolls Series, No. 87), ll. 361 f.; Higden-Trevisa *Polychronicon* (ed. Babington, Rolls Series No. 41), Vol. II, p. 409. Later English accounts also generally present a similar version, as for instance Geo. Peele's *Arraignment of Paris*; Jas. Beattie's *Judgment of Paris*, and Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, Act III, Sc. ii, etc. An interesting M. Eng. variant is found in *The Siege of Troye* (ed. Zietsch, *Herrig's Archiv*, Vol. 72), l. 435, where it is Juno who says:

That appul, Parys, gif þou me,  
 Thou shalt be wyse wilt þou ma lyve,

while Pallas makes no offer at all. Tennyson's *Oenone* furnishes the only parallel I have been able to find to the wisdom-offer of Juno. Undoubtedly, then, the offer of wisdom by Pallas (sometimes by Juno) is the prevailing offer in Middle English, as well as in later English literature.

For the immediate source of most of the M. Eng. versions (probably of all of them) we have not far to look. The first three versions mentioned above rest directly and the fourth indirectly upon the *Historia Destructionis Troiae* of Guido Delle Colonne (ca. 1287), where the promise of Pallas runs as follows: *Si vero palladem omnem ab ea humanam scientiam pro praemio consequeris*, Sig. d<sub>1</sub> verso 2 (Argentina edition). But as to the source of Guido's account, not much of a definite nature may be said. He is supposed, of course, to have translated Benôit de Sainte More's *Roman de Troie* (1160), but the latter author, following Dares Phrygius, gives only the offer of Venus (cf. l. 3894 f., ed. Joli, Paris, 1870). The *Roman d'Eneas* (early 12th cent.) gives the offer of Pallas as honor and prowess. There is but one other Old French version which appears before the time of Guido,

namely, in the *Floir et Blanceflour*, ca. 1160. Here we find that Pallas offers "prouece et savoir" (cf. l. 1465 f.), which, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is the first appearance in any literature of the wisdom-idea in direct connection with the offer of Pallas to Paris. I have not been able to find any source for the *Floir et Bl.* version, or to trace any connection between it and that of Guido.

However, Guido was acquainted with Fabius Planciades Fulgentius. In this early sixth century author's *Mitologiarum* (ed. Staveren, *Auctores Mythographi Latini*, 1742) Lib. II, i, there is an interesting passage under the title "de iudicio Paridis." Philosophers, he says, conceive of the life of humanity as being of three types,—the contemplative, the active, and the voluptuous. *Prima igitur contemplatiua est quae ad sapientiam et ad ueritatis inquisitionem pertinet.* The second is called active because it is devoted to the gaining of wealth and fame and honor; the third is called the voluptuous life because it is devoted to the gratification of all sensual desires. *Id itaque considerantes postea trium dearum ponunt certamina, id est Mineruam, Iunonem et Venerem de formae qualitate certantes.* It will be seen that in this homiletic treatment of the Paris-judgment, which is in a manner so characteristic of Medieval times, the author considers Minerva as corresponding to the life devoted to the search after wisdom and truth. Though the idea of Minerva being the goddess of wisdom is ancient enough, yet it seems to have remained for this author of the sixth century to associate that conception with the Paris-judgment. And it is probably from this suggestion that Guido got his idea of the wisdom-offer which he ascribes to Minerva in his *Historia*.

We have found, therefore that (1) the wisdom-offer of Pallas in the Paris-judgment is not of classical growth; but that its first literary expression is in the *Floir et Blanceflour*, an Old French poem of about 1160; that (2) in middle and late English literature the prevailing offer is wisdom and intellectual superiority, the source of which (in some cases certainly, in other cases probably) is Guido delle Colonne, 1287; and that (3) the ultimate source of the idea in literature may possibly be found in the *Mitologiarum* of Fulgentius.

WALTER CLYDE CURRY.

Vanderbilt University.

A NOTE ON *Hamlet*

In his *Two Notes on Hamlet*, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIX, 1-3, Dr. Joseph Quincy Adams, Jr., attempts to explain the passage:

*Hamlet*: For if the sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being a god<sup>1</sup> kissing carrion,—Have you a daughter?

*Polonius*: I have, my lord.

*Hamlet*: Let her not walk i' the sun: conception is a blessing, but not as your daughter may conceive. Friend, look to't.

*Hamlet*, II, ii, 181-185.

He suggests that Hamlet here refers to the king as the sun, giving as support for his conjecture the earlier line spoken by Hamlet, "I am too much i' the sun," which he takes to mean, "I am too much in royal favor, or in the royal presence." Hamlet, he believes, intends seriously to warn Polonius against the king, "that adulterate beast," thinking his uncle quite capable of seducing Ophelia.

This explanation is, I think, strengthened if we consider the early wide-spread belief in impregnation by the sun—a belief that has left a record in folk-tales and, to some extent, in other literature. Such stories must undoubtedly have been known to Shakespeare's contemporaries. The whole matter has been fully discussed from the point of view of primitive custom by Hartland<sup>2</sup> and by Frazer.<sup>3</sup> It is necessary here to cite only a few illustrations of the legend.

A story popular in Italy and Sicily narrates that a wizard foretold to a king that his queen would bear a daughter who would be impregnated by the sun in her fourteenth year. When the daughter was born, every precaution was taken to prevent her exposure to the sun. She was shut up in a tower into which the sun could not penetrate. One day, however, the girl scratched a hole in the wall with a bone obtained from her food, and the sun shone on her. A daughter was born to her as the result.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Adams reads *good*; in the light of the following note *god* is preferable.

<sup>2</sup> *The Legend of Perseus*, 1894; *Primitive Paternity*, F. L. S., 1909-10.

<sup>3</sup> *The Golden Bough*, II; *Balder the Beautiful*.

<sup>4</sup> *Perseus*, I, 99.

A similar legend is told of a Japanese maiden. While she lay sleeping by the shore of a lagoon, into her body "the rays of the sun drove like the shafts from a celestial bow," and in due time she became a mother.<sup>5</sup> The original form of the story of Danae it is supposed was due to this belief.<sup>6</sup> The incident appears in several European *märchen* which are variants of the Danae story. Somewhat similar is a Siberian story which tells of the daughter of a Khan who was secluded in a dark iron house, with only an old woman to attend her. One day the maiden asked the old woman where she went so often, and was told that there was a bright world outside in which her father and mother lived, and many other people. The girl then said, "'Good mother, I will tell nobody, but show me that bright world.' So the old woman took the girl out of the iron house. But when she saw the bright world, the girl tottered and fainted, and the eye of God fell upon her and she conceived."<sup>7</sup>

Such stories occur also in China, where they are especially connected with the mothers of distinguished emperors. They are found in Samoa, among the Admiralty Islanders, the North American Indians, and elsewhere.<sup>8</sup> The *Navaho Origin Legend* tells of the birth of a son to Estsánatlehi. She lay on a bare flat rock, with her feet toward the east and let the sun shine upon her. Later she said to her sister, "I feel . . . the motions of a child within me. It was for this that I let the sun shine upon me." After the child is born, he seeks for his father, the sun. After many difficult tests, the sun recognizes and arms his son, who returns to the earth and overcomes the enemies of his people.<sup>9</sup> "Among the Algonkin Indians there is a myth of the earth maiden who becomes a mother when looked upon by the sun. She gives birth to a daughter who is called Wakos ikwe, the fox woman. In time Wakos ikwe gives birth to a great hero, the benefactor of aboriginal man in America, the food-giver."<sup>10</sup>

This belief in the power of the sun is connected with the seclusion, in some countries, of girls at puberty. In New Guinea "daughters

<sup>5</sup> *Primitive Paternity*, I, 25.

<sup>6</sup> *The Golden Bough*, II, 37; *Primitive Paternity*, I, 25.

<sup>7</sup> *The Golden Bough*, II, 37.

<sup>8</sup> *Primitive Paternity*, I, 25.

<sup>9</sup> W. Matthews, *Navaho Legends*, 1897, p. 105.

<sup>10</sup> Jeremiah Curtin, *A Journey in Southern Siberia*, 1909, p. 305.



of chiefs, when they are about twelve years of age, are kept indoors for two or three years, never being allowed under any pretence, to descend from the house, and the house is so shaded that the sun cannot shine on them."<sup>11</sup> This practice seems to be illustrated in the story of Déirdre. I quote from a literal translation, made by Douglas Hyde, of a version found in a Belfast ms.<sup>12</sup> "copied at the end of the last or the beginning of the present century . . . from a copy which must have been fairly old":

"As for the girl, Conor took her under his own protection, and placed her in a moat apart, . . . Afterwards Déirdre was being generously nurtured by Lorcán and (other) ladies, . . . until she grew up a blossom bearing sapling, and until her beauty was beyond every degree surpassing. Moreover, she was nurtured with excessive luxury of meat and drink that her stature and ripeness might be the greater for it, and that she might be the sooner marriageable. This is how Déirdre's abode was (situated, namely) in a fortress of the Branch, according to the king's command, every (aperture for) light closed in the front of the dun, and the windows of the back (ordered) to be open. A beautiful orchard full of fruit (lay) at the back of the fort in which Déirdre might be walking for a while under the eye of her tutor at the beginning and the end of the day."<sup>13</sup>

Perhaps more interesting as giving firmer basis to the belief that this old superstition was common knowledge in Shakespeare's day is the fact that Spenser made use of it in describing the birth of the twins Belphebe and Amoret to Chrysogonee:

But wondrously they were begot and bred,  
Through influence of th' heavens fruitfull ray.  
As it in antique bookes is mentioned.

. . . . .  
Upon the grassy ground her selfe she layd

. . . . .  
The sunbeames bright upon her body playd,  
Being through former bathing mollified,  
And pierst into her wombe, where they embayd  
With so sweet sence and secret power unspide,  
That in her pregnant flesh they shortly fructified.

<sup>11</sup> *Balder*, I, 35.

<sup>12</sup> The text is edited by Douglas Hyde in *Zeit. f. Celt. Phil.*, II, i, 142.

<sup>13</sup> *A Literary History of Ireland*, p. 306.

Miraculous may seeme to him that reades  
 So strange ensample of conception;  
 But reason teacheth that the fruitfull seades  
 Of all things living, through impression  
 Of the sunbeames in moyst complexion,  
 Doe life conceive and quickned are by kynd:

*The Faerie Queene*, Book III, Canto VI, VI-VIII.

Probably many other literary records could be found of so widespread a folk belief. Shakespeare must have been familiar with the superstition. Moreover, in folk custom and ritual the king, or ruler, was so often spoken of as the sun<sup>14</sup> that had Polonius been on the alert to receive practical advice from Hamlet, he must easily have seen the import of the warning.

ROSE JEFFRIES PEBBLES.

*Vassar College.*

---

#### MILTON'S USE OF THE FORMS OF EPIC ADDRESS

There is a curious fact concerning Milton's use of the forms of epic address that, so far as I know, has not previously been noticed. There is a temptation to regard salutations like "Daughter of God and man, accomplished Eve," "Offspring of Heav'n and all Earth's Lord" as poetic conventionalities. But Milton's use of them is more subtle. So long as Adam and Eve are sinless in the garden, they address one another with this heroic courtesy. But the minute they taste the apple, they become plain "Adam" and "Eve" to each other, and so remain to the end of the story. The unfallen Adam can address his guilty spouse as the

Fairest of creation, last and best  
 Of all God's works,

still recognizing her as a mirror of the divine idea—to speak in Platonic terms. But after the fatal deed he says more bluntly, "Eve, now I see thou art exact of taste." The poetic effectiveness of this change can be felt at once, though the philosophical explanation of it is more difficult. Perhaps there is some Platonism implicit in it. It certainly is of a piece with the irreverent familiarity that is the first result of the knowledge that has darkened their

<sup>14</sup> *Primitive Paternity*, I, 26.

vision of one another's souls and caused them to see the body instead. The fallen angels, however, still continue to address one another in these forms of epic politeness, as they were wont to do in Heav'n, "Where honour due and reverence none neglects."

MARJORIE BARSTOW.

Vassar College.

#### CHAUCEUR AND DANTE AND THEIR SCRIBES

In the fourth book and sixth chapter of Dante's *Convivio* occurs the brief parenthetical remark, after an allusion to *Voluptade*,—"non dico *Voluntade*, ma scrivola per *p*." It is not far to suggest, as indeed has been suggested, that Dante was guarding against a scribal error he had too much reason to expect, and it is noteworthy that precisely this scribal error misled a later poet into inaccuracy. Chaucer, in lines 211 ff. of the *Parlement of Foules*, wrote:

Under a tre beside a welle I say  
Cupide our lord his arwes forge and file  
And at his fet his bowe al redy lay,  
And Wille his doghter tempred al this while  
The hedes in the welle: " . . .

The daughter of Cupid was not *Voluntade*, 'Wille,' but *Voluptade*, 'Pleasure.' Chaucer must have followed a text (of Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum*?) in which the word *Volutade* was misread, by him or another, so as to receive the nasal mark over the *u*, hence he translated it *Wille*. Professor Skeat, adopting the isolated reading of the arbitrary Cambridge ms., prints

And wel his doghter tempred al the whyle,

but the Globe Chaucer has the text as first printed above, which is the reading of the majority of the codices. The actual occurrence, in the English poet's work, of the error warned against by Dante, is an interesting coincidence, at least.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

Chicago.

## TWO SPANISH IMITATIONS OF AN ITALIAN SONNET

The rather absurd comparison of Nero's joy at the burning of Rome with the indifference of a lady to her lover's suffering is the theme of the two following sonnets by Spanish poets of the sixteenth century, Gutierre de Cetina and Hernando de Acuña.

*Gutierre de Cetina*

Mientra con gran temor por cada parte  
De Roma ardian las moradas bellas,  
Mientra que con el humo a las estrellas  
Subia el clamor del gran pueblo de Marte,  
Alegre esta Neron, subido en parte  
Do viendo el fuego oia las querellas,  
Mirando entre las llamas, cuales dellas  
Eran mayores, do su furia harte.  
Asi del alma mia la que gobierna  
Mi vida, mira el fuego, escucha el llanto,  
Y tiene el mayor mal por mayor juego;  
Y, a guisa de Neron, se alegra tanto  
Cuanto mas viendo en mi durar el fuego  
Piensa hacer su crueldad eterna.<sup>1</sup>

*Hernando de Acuña*

Mientra de parte en parte se abrasaba,  
Y en vivas llamas la gran Roma ardia,  
Al alto cielo el gran clamor subia  
Del pueblo todo, que su mal lloraba:  
Solo en parte Neron cantando estaba,  
Do el clamor miserable escarnecia,  
Y el incendio mayor mas alegria,  
Y el mayor llanto mas placer le daba:  
Asi de en medio el alma donde estais,  
Veis, Señora, mi fuego, y toda en llanto  
La turba de mis tristes pensamientos;  
Y tanto mas de verlo os alegrais,  
Quanto mas ardo, y por vos lloro, y quanto  
Me llegan mas al cabo mis tormentos.<sup>2</sup>

Inasmuch as both Cetina and Acuña are known to have translated frequently from Italian poets, we might be justified in ex-

<sup>1</sup> *Obras de Gutierre de Cetina*, ed. by D. Joaquín Hazañas y la Rúa, Vol. I, Sevilla, 1895, Sonnet cxxxi.

<sup>2</sup> *Varias Poesías*, compuestas por Don Hernando de Acuña, Madrid, 1804, p. 171.

plaining the similarity between these two sonnets by assuming the existence of a common Italian original. The Italian sonnet translated by the two Spanish poets was written by Giovanni Mozzarello and was included by Lodovico Domenichi in his famous anthology entitled *Rime diverse di molti eccellentiss. autori nuovamente raccolte. Libro primo*, which appeared at Venice in 1545.<sup>3</sup> The text here given will show the fidelity of the Spanish translations to the original.

Mentre i superbi tetti a parte a parte  
Ardean di Roma, et l'altre cose belle  
Mandaua il pianto infin soura le stelle  
Il popol tutto del figliuol di Marte:  
Sol cantaua Neron' asceso in parte,  
Onde schernia le genti meschinelle  
Fra se lodando hor queste fiamme, hor quelle;  
Per far scriuendo uergognar le carte.  
Cosi di mezzo il cor, ch'ella gouerna  
Mira lieta il mio incendio, et tutta in pianti  
De miei tristi pensier la turba afflitta  
Donna; che sol di cio par che si uanti?  
Essendo in mille esempi gia descritta  
Su crueltade, et la mia fiamma interna.<sup>4</sup>

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

#### A NOTE ON *Love's Labour's Lost*

Following Sidney Lee's "New Study of *Love's Labour's Lost*" (*Gentleman's Magazine*, Oct. 1880) the Furness Variorum Edition of that play (pp. 1, 2) states that the historical original of Biron is Marshal Biron, Henry of Navarre's chief ally in his struggle for the

<sup>3</sup> The text is taken from the second edition, p. 70, of Domenichi's collection which appeared at Venice in 1546. I have also found this sonnet in Lodovico Dolce's collection entitled *Rime di diversi, et eccellenti autori. Raccolte da i libri da noi altre volte impressi tra le quali se leggono molte non più vedute*. In Vinegia appresso Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari, et Fratelli, MDLVI, p. 265 and also in Ruscelli's *Fiori delle rime de' poeti illustri, In Venetia, per Giovanbattista et Melchior Sessa Fratelli*, 1558, p. 357.

<sup>4</sup> This sonnet was imitated in French by Philippe Desportes, *Hippolyte*, xxxvii. See Joseph Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, Montpellier, 1909, p. 235.

French throne. It is further asserted that the Marshall became the hero of George Chapman's *The Conspiracy of Duke Biron*, and *The Tragedy of Biron*, both produced in 1605. In *The French Renaissance in England* (1910), Mr. Lee, altering his earlier opinion, states without proof that the Biron of Chapman was the son of the Biron who suggested Shakespeare's character.

My purpose is to distinguish the two Birones and to indicate the validity of Mr. Lee's later statement. The Marshall Armand Biron and his son, Charles, both went over to the side of Henry IV in 1589. In 1592 the elder was killed in battle. During these three years, the period in which *Love's Labour's Lost* was almost certainly written,<sup>1</sup> the Marshal played a somewhat more important rôle in French affairs than did Charles.<sup>2</sup>

But more potent in bringing the elder Biron to the mind of the English public was the intimate association of the English troops with the Marshal, whom they frequently mentioned in their journals and correspondence. A good medium for comparing the father and the son is the *Journal of the Siege of Rouen*, written in 1591 by an English volunteer, Sir Thomas Coningsby.<sup>3</sup> Charles is incidentally referred to perhaps eight times. The Marshal is constantly mentioned as an adviser and friend of the English. One English leader wrote: "In this army we have not one friend but only Marshal Biron, whom we find very respective to Her Majesty and loving to her people."<sup>4</sup> That he was also highly regarded by Elizabeth and Essex is attested by their letters.<sup>5</sup>

Aside from the *Journal of the Siege of Rouen* I find no English notice of Charles until 1593. It seems evident therefore that Shakespeare must have had the popular Marshal Biron in mind when he wrote *Love's Labour's Lost*, rather than the son, Charles, who later became Chapman's hero.

ORAL S. COAD.

Columbia University.

<sup>1</sup> Charles Knight and F. G. Fleay conjecture 1589; W. A. B. Hertzberg, A. W. Ward, and H. P. Stokes about 1590; Nathan Drake, J. F. Royster, Neilson and Thorndike 1591; George Chalmers 1592.

<sup>2</sup> *Biographie Universelle*, Vol. IV, for comparison.

<sup>3</sup> *Camden Miscellany*, Vol. I.

<sup>4</sup> Birch's *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Vol. II, p. 323.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar of the Mss. of the Marquis of Salisbury*, 1583-94.



## BRIEF MENTION

Ever since the interest in the subject was revived by Mr. Bédier's study published a dozen years ago, Chateaubriand's account of our country and his journey thru it has been the center of a steadily augmenting literature. The most recent contributions are by Mr. Gilbert Chinard ("Notes sur le prologue d'*Atala*," *Mod. Phil.*, XIII, 29-40; "Notes sur le voyage de Chateaubriand en Amérique," *Univ. of Cal. Publications in Mod. Phil.*, IV, 269-349), who in the first place adds links to the chain of evidence that, however much we must curtail Chateaubriand's claims of a Cape-to-Cairo itinerary in the flesh, his *voyage autour de ses livres* was thoroughgoing and substantially precise. As for the actual extent of Chateaubriand's wanderings, Mr. Chinard reviews the whole subject, and, while he only confirms the impracticability of the Mississippi journey, irrevocably condemned to the domain of the fantastic from the moment Bédier's analysis appeared, he makes a good showing for the claim that the trip as far as Niagara offers no serious internal evidence of insubstantiality. It is encouraging, moreover, that little by little a few fixed points in that section of the itinerary are being located: Baltimore is of course in the list; Philadelphia and New York have been rendered almost equally definite; and now Mr. Chinard ("Notes sur le voyage," p. 287) has identified a detail in the account which furnishes strong objective confirmation of Chateaubriand's presence at Niagara Falls. What still faces us is that, while the traveler remained too short a time in America to have made his Mississippi excursion, he was here more than long enough to travel in comfortable fashion as far as Niagara. Further probing of the archives may yet enable Mr. Chinard or some other fortunate worker to fix for us the distribution of this leisure time.

E. C. A.

---

*The Letters of Edward Dowden and his Correspondents* (London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1914) reveal a man of exquisite taste, broad culture, serene accomplishment. A life so quiet that the chief events therein were the discoveries of rare editions was passed in a provincial society against the limitations of which he occasionally rebelled. He was a citizen of the world of letters. His work brought him into contact with many men; thru his *Southey* he became intimate with Sir Henry Taylor and Aubrey de Vere; thru his *Shelley* with the Rossettis; thru his *Shakespeare* with Furnivall and many more. Perhaps the most interesting of the letters are those which give Mr. Gosse's appeal to Dowden to interfere in the Swinburne-Furnivall controversy and Dowden's admirably judicious reply. A scholar who spared reluctantly to examination-papers the time more profitably spent upon research, he was yet

most conscientious in his teaching. Very notable is a letter of modest self-appraisal (p. 303), in which he weighs for a prospective student the advantages and disadvantages of work under his guidance. The greatest value of the letters, however, lies in the scattered comments, noted down fresh from the teeming brain, upon various poets, especially Wordsworth and Shelley. No letter is without some point of interest; each is a memorial of one who followed the pleasant paths of wisdom.

S. C. C.

---

*Jacke Jugeler.* Edited with introduction and notes by H. H. Williams, Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914. This reproduction of "the unique original in the collection of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K. G.," which contains also, as an Appendix, the first printing of two leaves of a presumably earlier edition (these fragments are also in the Devonshire collection), is an important contribution to the study of this "polytypic" play. In his notes Professor Williams has put the textual criticism and elucidation of the piece on a trustworthy basis. His excellent observations, supported by carefully collected evidence, are in striking contrast with the chance (and frequently erroneous) foot-notes of the Hazlitt edition. Two simple illustrations may be cited: *stoding* (310) is 'studying,' not 'stewing'; this is supported, as the editor might have observed, by the stage direction *Hic cogitabundo similis sedeat*; the *NED*. (tho not cited in this connection) comes to the rescue in such a strange tradition of misinterpretations as pertains to *Kyrie* (653). To touch the matter of emendations, even Professor Williams has overlooked the obvious requirement of *maisters* (985; cf. 949); and as to references to special studies, note 61 should refer the student to J. Heine's articles in *Anglia* xv, 41 f., 391 f., and to F. H. Sykes, *French Elements in Middle English*, Oxford, 1899. The larger problems of the play, its date, authorship, and purpose, are called up by this publication. In Professor Gayley's judgment (*Representative English Comedies*, 1903, pp. lxxviii f.) it is a burlesque attack upon transubstantiation; Professor Williams, in *Modern Language Review* vii (1912), 289 f. and now in his Introduction, holds that the 'farce' is by the author of *Roister Doister*, and that it is an allegorical repudiation of his "fictitious confession" of personal charges that had been brought against him; and, finally, the suggestions of Williams have led Dr. G. Dudok to attempt an answer to the question "Has *Jack Juggler* been written by the same author as *Ralph Roister Doister*?" (*Neophilologus*, i, 50-62; Groningen, 1915.) This last study of the problem results in a conviction that Udall wrote the piece during the reign of Queen Mary, "and very probably in the year 1554"; and that the autobiographic purpose (advocated by Williams) is

to be rejected in favor of the view (held by Gayley) that the serious, hidden purpose of the piece is "a subtle attack upon the Roman Catholic Church in general and upon the doctrine of transubstantiation in particular." Surely the author fixed an enduring enticement in his cryptogramic lines (998-999):

As this trifling enterlud yt before you hath bine rehersed  
May signifie sum further meaning if it be well serched.

---

A belated booklet is *The Parlement of the Three Ages: an Alliterative Poem on the Nine Worthies and the Heroes of Romance*, edited by I. Gollancz (Select Early English Poems, II; Oxford University Press, 1915). The exclusiveness of the *editio princeps* (prepared by the same editor for the Roxburghe Club; 1897) has been a regrettable barrier to the wider study and investigation of this poem, which is involved in a highly important problem in the literary history of the fourteenth century. In March, 1898, Kölbinger (*Engl. Stud.* xxv, 273) asked for an accessible edition of *Parlement* and *Winner and Waster*, to which a reply was made two years ago in a promise that the instalments of the series of texts begun by *Patience* (1913) would be issued quarterly; the first promised 'quarter' has been prolonged into a period of two years. This second edition of *Parlement* differs from the first in the representation of the text of the second ms. by a selected list of the more important variant readings; the notes have been revised; and the former Index Verborum has been converted into a good glossary. There is also some change in the illustrative texts of the Appendix. But these differences between the two editions do not mark at many points a present gain. Professor Gollancz cannot expect the serious student to accept the selected variants as an adequate substitute for the former parallel text, nor can he fail to suspect that it will be regretted that the plan of the series requires the reservation of *Winner and Waster* for a separate volume. It can only be hoped that amends will be made by a prompt publication of this companion piece, and that with it there will be given not only a view of the relation of these two poems to each other but also a view, in the light of special investigations, of the comprehensive question of the authorship of the group of poems with which these have become associated. Professor Gollancz has cancelled his former attribution of *Morte Arthur* to Huchown (Introduction, 1897, p. xix), and passed Dr. George Neilson by with a foot-note, and set the poet of *Sir Gawayne* beyond the reach of the author of *Parlement*. His admiring followers would be gratified to have from him something in the way of a coherent discussion of this vexed problem. Unfortunately there has not yet appeared an edition of Longuyon's *Vœux du Paon*; but Albert Herrmann has followed his *Untersuchungen über das Alexanderbuch* (Berlin, C.

Vogt, 1893), which is cited by Professor Gollancz, by two studies, which should also have been cited: *The Taymouth Castle Manuscript of Sir Gilbert Hay's Buik of King Alexander the Conquerour* (Progr., Berlin, R. Gaertner, 1898), and *The Forraye of Gadderis. The Vowis. Extracts from Sir Gilbert Hay's Buik of King Alexander the Conquerour* (*ibid.*, 1900). These last two studies, being in continuation and extension of the first, pertain to the distinction between the Arbuthnot *Buik* and that of Sir Gilbert Hay; and Herrmann's analysis of Sir Gilbert's version and the long passages he has abstracted from it serve to mitigate to a considerable extent the disadvantage implied in Professor Gollancz's words, "Still unprinted."

One must regret the duplication of effort that has resulted in the appearance within two years of two carefully annotated editions of that very mediocre performance Jonson's *Tale of a Tub*. The two editions—that by Scherer in Bang's *Materialien* (1913) and now the instalment by F. M. Snell of the series of Jonson's plays that has come from the English Seminary at Yale—in a way supplement each other. On the whole Miss Snell's treatment of the chief problem involved, that of the date of the play, is the more convincing. Scherer, like Small, Manly, Thorndike, and others, accepts the evidence for an early date of one stratum of the play and considers that upon a quantity of juvenile crudities Jonson later imposed some work of his dotage. Miss Snell, on the contrary, sides with Courthope, Gayley, and Nicholson in regarding the play as a whole as late work. She applies the various metrical tests with the result (a) that no appreciable difference is found between the parts usually thought early and those usually thought late; (b) that the play as a whole stands metrically with *The New Inn* and *The Magnetic Lady* as indubitably late work. The problem of the references to "the Queen" is acceptably explained by pointing to such parallels as "King Edward, our late liege" (I, v, 33) and "old John Heywood" (v, iii, 74). Jonson is deliberately giving his play an archaic setting. Miss Snell might have called attention to the same interest in an earlier less sophisticated era in England evinced by *The Devil is an Ass*. Scherer's study of sources is fuller and more compact than Miss Snell's, and he gives a paragraph to the dialect employed in the piece for which the only equivalent in Snell is a series of scattered explanations in the notes. On the other hand she offers a shrewd and sufficient discussion of the value of the play for which Scherer affords no substitute. On other points they are in substantial accord. Miss Snell's notes are fuller, at times needlessly full, a mass of easily accessible information being reprinted. Despite a few slips (*e. g.*, her references to Gayley's *Rep. Eng. Com.*), one has confidence in her general accuracy.

S. C. C.

